

THE HOMELAND SECURITY *NEWS CLIPS*

PREPARED FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY BY BULLETIN INTELLIGENCE WWW.BULLETININTELLIGENCE.COM/DHS

TO: THE SECRETARY AND SENIOR STAFF

DATE: MONDAY, JULY 2, 2018 5:00 AM EDT

TODAY'S EDITION

Leading DHS News

[Trump Welcomes Democrats' Calls To Abolish ICE: 'They're Going To Get Beaten So Badly' \(WT\)](#) 5

[Trump, Looking To Midterms, Attacks Democrats On Calls To Abolish ICE \(NYT\)](#) 6

[Trump: Democrats Will Get 'Beaten So Badly' If They Continue Push To Abolish ICE \(CALLER\)](#) 7

[President Trump: Dems Will Be 'Beaten So Badly' If They Run On Abolishing ICE \(TWNHALL\)](#) 7

[These Democrats Want To Abolish ICE \(WASHEX\)](#) 8

[Immigration Activists Condemn ICE, Family Detention \(WT\)](#) 8

['A Political Suicide March': Trump Aims To Inflict Political Pain On Democrats Over Calls To Abolish Immigration Enforcement Agency \(WP\)](#) 9

[Donald Trump Defends ICE From Radical Left \(BREITBART\)](#) 11

[Donald Trump: Democrats Will Be 'Beaten So Badly' If They Campaign To Abolish ICE \(USAT\)](#) 11

[Thousands March Against US Immigration Policy \(AFP\)](#) 12

[Trump Slams Democrats' Push To Abolish ICE \(WT\)](#) 13

['Zero Chance' — Trump Hits Back At Calls To Abolish ICE \(CALLER\)](#) 14

[Warren Joins Calls To Get Rid Of ICE \(HILL\)](#) 14

[Dem Lawmaker: ICE Has Become A 'Rogue Agency' \(HILL\)](#) 14

[Trump Hits Dems Pushing To Abolish ICE: 'They're Going To Get Beaten So Badly' \(HILL\)](#) 15

[Trump Doubles Down Amid Protests: Illegal Border Crossers Must Be Deported 'Immediately' \(HILL\)](#) 15

[Trump Asserts He Didn't Push House GOP On Immigration \(AP\)](#) 16

[Trump Falsely Claims He Never Told House Republicans To Vote For Immigration Bill \(POLITICO\)](#) 17

[Protesters Flood US Cities To Fight Trump Immigration Policy \(AP\)](#) 17

[Protesters Across U.S. Call On Trump To Reunite Immigrant Families \(REU\)](#) 18

[Open Borders Protesters Target 2018: 'Vote Them Out' \(BREITBART\)](#) 19

[Thousands March In Washington In Wilting Heat To Protest Trump's Immigration Policy \(WP\)](#) 19

[Thousands Gather In DC To Protest Trump Immigration Policies \(HILL\)](#) 21

[Dem Lawmakers Join Nationwide Protests Against Trump Immigration Policies \(HILL\)](#) 22

[Celebrities Show Their Support For #FamiliesBelongTogether Marches \(HILL\)](#) 23

[WATCH: Portland Police Declare Riot, Revoke Protest Permit As Sides Clash \(BREITBART\)](#) 24

[How 'Abolish ICE' Went From Social Media To Progressive Candidates' Rallying Cry \(NYT\)](#) 24

[Nobody Knows How 'abolish ICE' Plays Politically \(WP\)](#) 26

[Abolish ICE Calls Expose Democrats Ideological Split \(WT\)](#) 27

[Sen. Dick Durbin Calls ICE 'A Group Of Incompetents' \(CALLER\)](#) 28

[Poll: 3-in-4 Swing Voters Oppose Democrat Plan To Abolish ICE \(BREITBART\)](#) 28

DHS News

[DHS Chooses Vitiello To Lead Immigration And Customs Agency \(AP\)](#) 29

[Top Border Patrol Official To Serve As Acting Director Of Immigration And Customs Agency \(NYT\)](#) 29

[Vitiello Tapped As Acting ICE Director \(BLOOM\)](#) 30

[Lifelong Border Patrol Agent Ronald Vitiello Picked To Lead ICE \(WASHEX\)](#) 30

[Controversial ICE Chief Retiring, Replacement Named \(CNNINTL\)](#) 31

[New Acting ICE Head Named As Agency Continues To Be Criticized \(POLITICO\)](#) 32

[Senior Border Patrol Official Tapped To Serve As Acting ICE Director \(HILL\)](#) 32

[With 'Head Held High,' Exiting ICE Chief Thomas Homan Wants Trump To Do Even More \(WASHEX\)](#) 33

Border Wall

[Texas School District OKs Possible Border Wall Land Survey \(AP\)](#) 33

[Border Patrol Agent: Trump's Wall Is The Best Way To End To The Humanitarian Crisis On Our Southern Border \(FOX\)](#) 34

Border Security

[Border Arrests Between Ports Of Entry Dropped By 6,000 In June: Report \(WASHEX\)](#) 34

[DHS Projected To Make Fewer Border Arrests In June: Report \(HILL\)](#) 35

[Arrests At U.S.-Mexico Border Projected To Drop In June \(REU\)](#) 36

[Arrests At U.S.-Mexico Border Projected To Drop In June \(REU\)](#) 36

[APNewsBreak: Border Patrol Arrests Drop Sharply In June \(AP\)](#) 36

[Concern Over Using US Military To Help Border Enforcement \(AP\)](#) 36

[Trump: Melania Saw 'the Danger' During Her Mexican Border Visits \(NYPOST\)](#) 37

[Vermont US Sen. Leahy Seeks To Limit Border Search Zones \(AP\)](#) 38

[Border Patrol Agent Explains Why Asylum Seekers Cross The US Illegally \(BIZINDER\)](#) 38

Aviation Security

[It Started With Your Shoes, Then Your Water. Now The TSA Wants Your Snacks. \(WP\)](#) 39

Immigration Policy

["Are You Alone Now?" \(WP\)](#) 40

[Donald Trump Squanders Credibility In Family Separation Drama \(USAT\)](#) 43

[Anthony Scaramucci: Democrats Have The Real Credibility Problem \(USAT\)](#) 44

[Zero Tolerance Sowed Confusion From Start \(AP\)](#) 44

[The Latest: ACLU Says Government Wrong To Detain Families \(AP\)](#) 45

[U.S. Won't Say How It Will Reunite Split-Up Immigrant Families \(BLOOM\)](#) 48

[House Republicans Probe HHS Office In Charge Of Migrant Children \(HILL\)](#) 49

[Dem Senator Blasts Administration For 'Cruelty And Incompetence' After Immigration Briefing \(HILL\)](#) 50

[After 40 Days Apart And A Missed Flight, A Migrant Family Reunites \(NYT\)](#) 51

[Salvadoran Deportee Finally Reunited With His Separated Daughter \(WP\)](#) 51

[12-year-old Immigrant Prescribed Antidepressants In Shelter Due To Distress Over Family Separation. Lawsuit Alleges \(WP\)](#) 52

[Reunite Immigrant Kids With Their Families \(NYT\)](#) 53

[Lawsuit Challenges Trump Administration's Border-Detention Practices \(WSJ\)](#) 54

[Inspector General: ICE Failed In Conditions At Child Detention Centers \(HILL\)](#) 54

[Parents And Children Remain Separated By Miles And Bureaucracy \(NYT\)](#) 54

[Media Outlets Unite To Track Down Migrant Children Separated From Parents Under Trump Policy \(HILL\)](#) 56

[Fast-tracking Of Illegal Border Crossing Cases Coming To California Soon \(LAT\)](#) 56

[Trump Administration May Seek To Detain Migrant Families Longer Than Previously Allowed \(WP\)](#) 58

[Trump Admin Likely To Detain Migrant Families For Months During Immigration Proceedings: Report \(HILL\)](#) 59

[U.S. Government Says It Will Detain Migrant Children With Parents \(REU\)](#) 59

[US Lawyers: Ruling Allows Detention Of Immigrant Families \(AP\)](#) 60

[Trump Administration Argues It Can Detain Migrant Children And Parents Together Without Time Limits \(USAT\)](#) 60

[Exclusive: Trump DOJ Plan Would Bar Most Central Americans From Asylum \(VOX\)](#) 61

[Report: DOJ Planning To Tighten Asylum Rules \(HILL\)](#) 64

[Report: Draft DOJ Rule Would Deny Asylum For Illegal Border Crossers \(AXIOS\)](#) 65

[Top House Dems Demand Broad Watchdog Investigations Into Trump Immigration Policy \(HILL\)](#) 65

[The Trump Administration Says It's A 'Myth' That Families That Ask For Asylum At Ports Of Entry Are Separated. It Happens Frequently, Records Show \(LAT\)](#) 66

[Trump Admin Ran 'Pilot Program' For Separating Migrant Families In 2017 \(NBCNEWS\)](#) 68

[Concern Over Using US Military To Help Border Enforcement \(AP\)](#) 71

[Congress Leaves Town Without Voting On Fix To Stop Family Separations At Border \(USAT\)](#) 72

[Dem Slams Congress For Taking Recess Despite Migrant Families Still Being Separated \(HILL\)](#) 73

[Trump Threatens Cuts To Central America Aid. He'll Have To Go Through Granger First \(MCT\)](#) 73

[NumbersUSA: For Longtime Backer Of Hard-line Immigration Measures, The Time Is Now \(MCT\)](#) 75

[We May Be Able To Help Reunite Immigrant Children With Parents, Nonprofit Says \(DMN\)](#) 76

[Sponsors Of Migrant Children Face Steep Transport Fees And Red Tape \(NYT\)](#) 78

[Salvadoran Mother Is Reunited With Her Son After Separation \(WTOPFM\)](#) 80

[A Migrant Mother Had To Pay \\$576.20 To Be Reunited With Her 7-Year-Old Son \(MOJO\)](#) 81

[CNN Airls Reunification Of Illegal Alien Family But Cut Away From Trump Honoring Angel Families \(CALLER\)](#) 81

[Despite Trump, American Support For Legal Immigration Is Growing \(BLOOM\) 82](#)
[With Ban Upheld, Travel Industry Urges A Welcome For Tourists \(NYT\) 82](#)
[What It Costs To Be Smuggled Across The U.S. Border \(NYT\) 83](#)

Immigration Enforcement

[Manhattan's Immigration Court Begins Video Only Hearings \(WSJ\) 91](#)
[Man Arrested On Rape Charge, Referred To ICE \(AP\) 91](#)
[Brazilian Rape Suspect Busted In Barnstable Was Deported In 2007 \(BOSH\) 92](#)
[Sheriff Cummings' ICE-Certified Deputies Assist On First 287\(g\) Case \(CAPETDAY\) 92](#)
[Illinois Congressman Seeks Halt To Lithuanian's Extradition \(AP\) 92](#)
[ICE Arrests Three From El Salvador In Santa Fe \(ALBQJRN\) 93](#)
[Deportation Fears Erased For Green-card Carrying Arleta Resident Picked Up By ICE At His Home \(LADN\) 93](#)

Criminal Investigations

[Has Trump 'Watched ICE Liberate Towns From The Grasp Of MS-13'? \(NYT\) 94](#)
[MS-13 Beat Me Up And Threatened To Kill Me. Then The US Government Took My Kids. \(USAT\) 95](#)
[\\$1.7M In Fentanyl From China Detected By Drug-sniffing Dog At Philadelphia Port \(FOX\) 95](#)

Secret Service

['Stuttering John' Says He Was Visited By Secret Service After Trump Prank Call \(FOX\) 96](#)
[He Gripped No One Cared About His Prank Call To Trump. Then, He Said, The Secret Service Knocked. \(WP\) 96](#)
[Comedian Claims Secret Service Visited Him After He Tricked Trump Into Phone Call \(HILL\) 97](#)
[Comedian Who Allegedly Prank-called Trump Says He Has Hired Michael Avenatti \(HILL\) 98](#)

Emergency Response

[After Court Order, FEMA Allows Hurricane Maria Survivors To Stay In Hotels 5 Additional Days \(ABCNEWS\) 98](#)
[Housing Extended For 1,700 Puerto Rican Hurricane Evacuees \(AP\) 99](#)
[Judge Delays Aid Deadline For Displaced Puerto Ricans After Last-minute Lawsuit By Advocacy Groups \(ORLS\) 100](#)

Coast Guard

[American Tourist Dies In Boat Explosion In The Bahamas \(CNN\) 101](#)
[7 Rescued In Alaska Waters After Fishing Boat Sinks \(AP\) 101](#)
[US Coast Guard: Despite Law Pot Illegal On Lake Champlain \(AP\) 101](#)

Cyber News

[China's ZTE Shakes Up Board In Bid For U.S. Ban Lift \(REU\) 102](#)
[ZTE Appoints Chairman In Another Step Toward Lifting Of U.S. Ban \(BLOOM\) 102](#)
[A Massive Cache Of Law Enforcement Personnel Data Has Leaked \(ZDNET\) 102](#)
[U.S. Law Enforcement Training Center Data Breach 'Exposes Cops, FBI Agents' \(NSWK\) 104](#)
[Data Breach Exposes Details Of FBI, Customs And Border Agents: Report \(WT\) 104](#)
[Homeland Security Subpoenas Twitter For Data Breach Finder's Account \(ZDNET\) 105](#)
[Russian Hacking Could Affect U.S. Agriculture Systems, Says Auburn Professor \(PLAINSMAN\) 106](#)
[With \\$1 Million Grant, Howard Looks To Help Fix Cybersecurity Concerns \(WP\) 107](#)
[How Your Smart Fridge Might Be Mining Bitcoin For Criminals \(AP\) 107](#)
[Cyber Spy Agency Gets Statutory Powers \(DAYMAIL\) 109](#)
[Adidas Hack: 'Millions' Of U.S. Website Customers Warned Of Cyber Theft \(NSWK\) 109](#)
[Following Russian Attacks, Cyber Exercise Focuses On Infrastructure \(MERTALK\) 109](#)
[Cheap Tech And Widespread Internet Access Fuel Rise In Cybersex Trafficking \(NBCNEWS\) 110](#)

Terrorism Investigations

[N.S.A. Purges Hundreds Of Millions Of Call And Text Records \(NYT\) 112](#)
[South Florida Man Pleads Guilty To Making Bomb Threats Against Mosque \(FLSUNSEN\) 113](#)
[Cutler Bay, FL Man Admits Phoning In Bomb Threats To Mosque \(MH\) 113](#)
[Man Admits Making Bomb Threat Targeting Florida Mosque \(REU\) 114](#)
[Man Charged In Bucks Co. Bomb Probe Out On Bail \(DBNBPATC\) 114](#)
[The Case Of The Purloined Poultry: How ISIS Prosecuted Petty Crime \(NYT\) 114](#)
[Sikhs And Hindus Bear Brunt Of Latest Afghanistan Suicide Attack \(NYT\) 117](#)
[Suicide Bomber Targets Sikhs, Hindus In Afghanistan; 19 Dead \(AP\) 118](#)
[Suicide Attack During Ghani Visit Kills Almost 20 In Eastern Afghanistan \(WP\) 119](#)
[Islamist Militants Attack African Military Base In Mali, At Least Six Dead \(REU\) 120](#)
[3 Killed In Attack On West African Counterterrorism Force's HQ \(AP\) 120](#)

National Security News

[Iowa's Digital Driver's Licenses, Coming In 2019, Still A Muddle \(DMR\) 120](#)

[CFATS: What It And Its Renewal Means To Ag Retail \(AGPRO\) 122](#)

[Trump And The Supreme Court Got It Wrong. The Travel Ban Won't Keep Us Safe \(WP\) 122](#)

Other DHS News

[Man Accused Of Trying To Bribe ICE To Deport Wife \(AP\) 124](#)

[Feds, Former Student Reach Lawsuit Deal \(BRVLH\) 124](#)

Global Media

[E.U. Leaders Agree On The Outline Of A Migration Deal \(WP\) 124](#)

[Italy PM Cheers EU Migration Deal, Decision On Migrant Centers Later \(REU\) 125](#)

[Europe Shifts Toward Tougher Approach On Immigration \(WSJ\) 125](#)

[EU's Migrant Deal Reflects Ascendance Of Nativist Parties \(WSJ\) 125](#)

[Europe Wants To Outsource Asylum Processing. Critics Say It's Abdicating Its Responsibilities \(WP\) 125](#)

[In U.S. And Europe, Migration Conflict Points To Deeper Political Problems \(NYT\) 127](#)

[Europe Moves In Parallel To U.S. To Manage Immigration \(WSJ\) 129](#)

[Spain's Migrant Wave Grows, Even As Europe's Subsidies \(NYT\) 129](#)

[Spain Feels The Heat As Migrants Shift Route Into Europe \(AP\) 130](#)

[Andres Manuel Lopez Obrador Wins The Mexico Presidential Election As His Competitors Concede Based On Exit Polls Giving Him A Landslide Victory \(LAT\) 132](#)

[Andrés Manuel López Obrador Poised To Win Mexican Presidential Race \(WP\) 134](#)

[Leftist Wins Mexico Presidency In Landslide With Mandate To Reshape Nation \(NYT\) 135](#)

[Merkel's Bavarian Allies Row Over EU Migrant Deal \(REU\) 137](#)

[Future Of Germany's Angela Merkel In Question After Coalition Allies Reject Migration Deal \(WSJ\) 137](#)

National News

[Trump: 'Big Week' Ahead With A Focus On Picking A Supreme Court Nominee \(WASHEX\) 137](#)

[Trump Says Abortion Rights Could Be Decided By States \(WSJ\) 138](#)

[President Trump: I 'Probably Won't' Ask Possible Supreme Court Nominees About Roe V. Wade \(USAT\) 138](#)

[Trump: Abortion Rights 'Could Very Well End Up With States At Some Point' \(BREITBART\) 139](#)

[Donald Trump Says Abortion Rights Could Be Left Up To States \(TIME\) 139](#)

[Donald Trump: States May Decide Abortion Rights, 'Honored' Kennedy Retired During His Presidency \(NSWK\) 139](#)

[Trump: I'm Told I Shouldn't Ask My SCOTUS Nominee About Roe V. Wade \(YAHOO\) 140](#)

[Trump Says His U.S. Supreme Court Pick Will Be 'Outstanding' \(NJCOM\) 141](#)

[Trump Judicial Adviser: No Top Supreme Court Candidates 'Have Clear Position' On Roe V. Wade \(WASHEX\) 142](#)

[Trump's Judicial Adviser Names Four Potential Supreme Court Nominees \(WASHFRBE\) 142](#)

[Bulwark Against An Abortion Ban? Medical Advances \(NYT\) 143](#)

[Evangelical Leaders Downplay Potential Roe V. Wade Reversal \(PATNEWS\) 145](#)

[This Is The Fight Of Our Lives. Here's How We Win It. \(WP\) 147](#)

[After Eyeing The Exits, White House Officials Will Likely Stay Through Supreme Court Confirmation: Sources \(ABCNEWS\) 148](#)

[Senator Collins Will Not Back Anti-abortion Supreme Court Nominee \(REU\) 149](#)

[Susan Collins, Pivotal Moderate, Says 'Hostility' To Roe Would Sway Her Vote \(NYT\) 149](#)

[Susan Collins Says She Won't Support Supreme Court Nominee Who Demonstrates 'hostility To Roe V. Wade' \(WP\) 150](#)

[Collins: White House Has Expanded Its List Of Potential Supreme Court Picks \(HILL\) 151](#)

[Collins Says Supreme Court Pick Who'd Overturn Roe V. Wade 'would Not Be Acceptable' \(NYPOST\) 151](#)

[Collins Says She Can't Back Judge Who Would Strike Roe V. Wade \(BLOOM\) 152](#)

[Collins Would Oppose Court Pick With Roe V Wade 'Hostility' \(AP\) 153](#)

[GOP Sen. Susan Collins Won't Support Supreme Court Nominee Hostile To Roe V. Wade \(WT\) 154](#)

[Dick Durbin Accuses Trump Of Seeking Supreme Court Nominee Who'd Overturn Roe V. Wade, Obamacare \(WT\) 154](#)

[Wrong Vote On Trump Supreme Court Pick Could Be 'Career-ending Move,' Sen. Maria Cantwell Warns \(WT\) 155](#)

[Dem Senator Says Supreme Court Vote Could Be 'Career Ending' For Lawmakers \(HILL\) 155](#)

[Supreme Court Nomination Will Put Red-state Democrats In Even Bigger Campaign Quandary \(WT\) 156](#)

[Trump Delaying NAFTA Deal Until After Midterm Elections \(AP\) 157](#)

[Trump Cites Car-Tariff Threat As Biggest Trade Leverage \(WSJ\) 157](#)
[EU Warns Washington Of 'Harmful' Impact On US Of Car Tariffs \(POLITICEU\) 157](#)
[Canada Tariffs On US Goods From Ketchup To Lawn Mowers Begin \(AP\) 158](#)
[Trump Stands Firm On Trade, Even As Foreign Tariffs Begin Kicking In \(WP\) 159](#)
[Trump Says He Won't Sign Any NAFTA Deal Until After Midterms \(WP\) 160](#)
[EU Warns Of \\$300bn Hit To US Over Car Import Tariffs \(FT\) 161](#)
[Trump Says Harley-Davidson Will Take A 'big Hit' \(NYPOST\) 161](#)
[Trump: Harley-Davidson Will Take 'big Hit' \(POLITICO\) 161](#)
[Trump Piles Pressure On Saudis Flummoxed By Oil-Price Increase \(BLOOM\) 161](#)

[The Oil Weapon Can Fell The Ayatollahs \(WSJ\) 162](#)
[Exclusive: A Leaked Trump Bill To Blow Up The WTO \(AXIOS\) 162](#)
[Dollar Rally Ripples Globally, Leading Investors To Reverse Course \(WSJ\) 163](#)
[Trade War Winner Is Who Loses Least As U.S.-China Tariffs Loom \(BLOOM\) 163](#)
[Taiwan's Technology Secrets Come Under Assault From China \(WSJ\) 164](#)
[America Needs To Sell More Weapons \(WSJ\) 164](#)
[States Act On Their Own To Fill Holes Washington Is Knocking In Affordable Care Act \(WP\) 164](#)
[The IRS Can Save American Health Care \(WSJ\) 166](#)
[The Malaria Fight Stalls As Children Die By The Hundreds Of Thousands \(WP\) 166](#)
[Judge: Rosenstein's 'Any Links' Mandate Gives Mueller A Broad Scope \(WT\) 167](#)

LEADING DHS NEWS

Trump Welcomes Democrats' Calls To Abolish ICE: 'They're Going To Get Beaten So Badly'

By Dave Boyer

[Washington Times](#), July 1, 2018

President Trump said Sunday that Democrats "will never win another election" if they keep pushing to abolish Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

"I hope they keep thinking about it. Because they're going to get beaten so badly," he told Fox News' Maria Bartiromo. "You get rid of ICE, you're going to have a country that you're going to be afraid to walk out of your house. I love that issue if they're going to actually do that."

He predicted that Democratic leaders will alienate voters this year with an agenda of lax immigration enforcement.

"If the Democrats go left... between [Rep.] Maxine Waters, and [House minority leader] Nancy Pelosi and getting rid of ICE, and having open borders ... all it's going to do is leads to massive, massive crime," Mr. Trump said. "That's going to be their platform, open borders, which equals crime. I think they'll never win another election, so I'm actually quite happy about it."

His comments came amid weekend protests across the country against the administration's immigration policies, with calls to abolish ICE endorsed by leading Democrats such as Sens. Elizabeth Warren

of Massachusetts and Kirsten Gillibrand of New York, and New York City Mayor Bill de Blasio.

Tens of thousands of demonstrators marched against the administration's policy of prosecuting all illegal immigrant adults on criminal charges and the separation of about 2,500 illegal immigrant children from their families, a policy which has since been rescinded by Mr. Trump.

"We need to rebuild our immigration system from top to bottom, starting by replacing ICE with something that reflects our morality," Ms. Warren said at a rally in Boston on Saturday.

Sen. Dick Durbin, Illinois Democrat, called ICE employees "incompetents."

Mr. Trump tweeted Sunday, "The Liberal Left, also known as the Democrats, want to get rid of ICE, who do a fantastic job, and want Open Borders. Crime would be rampant and uncontrollable! Make America Great Again."

ICE, part of the Department of Homeland Security, is responsible for arresting and deporting illegal immigrants. In the wake of the now-rescinded policy of separating illegal migrant children from their families, critics on the left increasingly are protesting the agency's actions, including about 200 people who demonstrated along a highway in New Jersey Saturday near the Trump National Golf Club where the president and his family spent the weekend.

The protesters near the golf club held signs proclaiming messages such as, "My civility is locked in a cage/reunite families now," "Even the Trump family belongs together," and "We the people say no to the Trump agenda" taped over a rainbow flag.

The president said abolishing ICE will never happen on his watch.

"To the great and brave men and women of ICE, do not worry or lose your spirit," Mr. Trump tweeted. "You are doing a fantastic job of keeping us safe by eradicating the worst criminal elements. So brave! The radical left Dems want you out. Next it will be all police. Zero chance, It will never happen!"

The president said ICE officials are doing a vital job protecting the country.

"The Democrats are making a strong push to abolish ICE, one of the smartest, toughest and most spirited law enforcement groups of men and women that I have ever seen. I have watched ICE liberate towns from the grasp of MS-13 & clean out the toughest of situations. They are great!" he said on Twitter.

Trump, Looking To Midterms, Attacks Democrats On Calls To Abolish ICE

By Emily Cochrane

[New York Times](#), July 1, 2018

President Trump has gone on the attack against Democratic lawmakers who have called for abolishing Immigration and Customs Enforcement, seeking to seize political advantage on an issue that has put him on the defensive for weeks and offer a winning message for Republicans facing a forbidding midterm election.

"You get rid of ICE, you're going to have a country that you're going to be afraid to walk out of your house," Mr. Trump said in a wide-ranging interview that aired on Fox News's "Sunday Morning Futures."

The president encouraged Democratic candidates to embrace demands to dissolve the agency, saying that doing so would doom the party at the polls. "They're going to get beaten so badly," he said.

"I think they'll never win another election," he added. "So I'm actually quite happy about it."

The president spent part of his weekend at his New Jersey golf resort tweeting his support for the agency and its involvement in implementing his "zero tolerance" immigration policy, which resulted in more than 2,000 family separations along the southwest border and prompted an outcry from Democrats and many Republicans.

Mr. Trump also signaled during the interview that he would not back away from a brewing trade war between the United States and its allies, skewering trading partners and saying that he would wait until after the midterm elections to sign a new North American Free Trade Agreement with Canada and Mexico.

"I could sign it tomorrow, but I'm not happy with it," he told Maria Bartiromo, the show's anchor. The three

countries have been negotiating for more than a year, but have not reached a deal. "I want to make it more fair, O.K.?"

And while experts, farmers and American companies have warned against the economic consequences of his tariffs and trade skirmishes with the European Union, Canada, Mexico, China and South Korea, the president defended his tariffs and potential calls for more.

"We lose with everybody," Mr. Trump said. "We're going to make it reciprocal, we're going to make them fair, and I will tell you that — you don't know about this, but every country is calling every day, saying, 'Let's make a deal, let's make a deal.' It's going to all work out."

He dismissed the concerns of companies like General Motors and Harley-Davidson, which have both warned against the economic consequences of a trade war caused by tariffs. Instead, he warned, voters were unhappy with Harley-Davidson's decision to move some production overseas to avoid tariffs, saying that the company would "take a big hit."

"I guarantee you everybody that ever bought a Harley-Davidson voted for Trump," he said. "And they're very unhappy about it."

A demand for more trade concessions was one part of a campaign message Mr. Trump appeared to outline for Republicans in November's elections, which also included putting another conservative on the Supreme Court and endorsing the administration's crackdown on immigration.

That plan appears to include seizing as a political weapon the growing call among liberal activists to dissolve ICE, shifting the battle to Democrats' fault lines on immigration rather than the rifts among Republicans that have been exposed by Mr. Trump's policies.

But even as Mr. Trump encouraged the liberal embrace of abolishing ICE, he had promised earlier in the weekend on Twitter that there was "zero chance, it will never happen!"

Democrats have been united against Mr. Trump's family separation policy, which he officially ended through an executive order. On Saturday, demonstrators gathered across the nation — including outside the White House and miles from the Bedminster resort where he spent the weekend — to protest the zero-tolerance policy and the government's struggle to reunite families.

But only a small number of Democratic lawmakers have called for abolishing ICE. Still, their ranks have been growing, especially since the No. 4 House Democrat was unseated in a primary last week by a liberal challenger who had called for eliminating ICE.

The agency, which has struggled to balance its role in transnational investigations and deportations, is best known for its division responsible for arresting, detaining and deporting unauthorized immigrants. Under the Trump administration, ICE has faced growing backlash over its tactics, including the arrest of undocumented immigrants as they drop their children off at school, and detaining and deporting those with minor offenses.

On Thursday, Kirsten Gillibrand, Democrat of New York, became the first senator to directly support the agency's abolishment.

"I believe you should get rid of it, start over, reimagine it and build something that actually works," Ms. Gillibrand said on CNN.

In the president's interview, which was recorded Friday, he sought to use such calls to portray Democrats as extremists, repeating an exaggerated claim that he has "watched ICE liberate towns from the grasp of MS-13."

He reiterated his point in a tweet Sunday.

"The Liberal Left, also known as the Democrats, want to get rid of ICE, who do a fantastic job, and want Open Borders," he tweeted. "Crime would be rampant and uncontrollable!"

And in the interview, he warned liberal activists to "just take it easy."

"Some of the radical ideas, I really think they're very bad for the country," he said. "I think they're actually very dangerous for the country."

Trump: Democrats Will Get 'Beaten So Badly' If They Continue Push To Abolish ICE

By Chuck Ross

[Daily Caller](#), July 1, 2018

President Donald Trump says that he hopes that Democrats continue pushing to abolish U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, saying that the party will "get beaten so badly" in the upcoming midterm elections.

Trump addressed Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez's stunning defeat in a New York congressional primary over Joe Crowley, one of the top Democratic leaders in the House, in an interview with Fox News' Maria Bartiromo that aired Sunday.

Ocasio-Cortez, a dues-paying member of the Democratic Socialists of America, ran on a plank of abolishing ICE over what she claims are civil rights and human rights abuses stemming from the agencies' response to illegal immigration on the southern border. (RELATED: Dem Senator Calls For Abolishing ICE;

Forgets What She Said About Illegal Immigration In 2009)

Some mainstream Democrats have started backing the movement. New York Sen. Kirsten Gillibrand came out Friday in support of abolishing the immigration agency, which was founded in 2003.

"Well I hope they keep thinking about it. Because they're going to get beaten so badly," Trump said Sunday of Democrats' opposition to ICE. (RELATED: Ocasio-Cortez: Abolishing ICE Is 'Common Sense')

"You know ICE, these are the guys that go in and take MS-13, and they take them out. Because they're much tougher than MS-13, like by a factor of 10."

"You get rid of ICE you're going to have a country that you're going to be afraid to walk out of your house. I love that issue if they're going to actually do that. They're seriously talking about that because they — you are going to have a country that's crime ridden. The Border Patrol, the Border Patrol agents, ICE these people are incredible," said Trump.

"But ICE, Border Patrol these are incredible patriots. The job they have is so dangerous," he continued.

President Trump: Dems Will Be 'Beaten So Badly' If They Run On Abolishing ICE

By Timothy Meads

[Townhall](#), July 1, 2018

President Donald J. Trump sat down for an interview with Fox News' Maria Bartiromo over the weekend and gloated that if the Democrats run campaigns for the 2018 midterms and 2020 presidential elections based on the idea of the abolishing the Immigration and Customs Enforcement agency, then they will be 'beaten so badly' by their Republican opponents it will not even be close.

"Well I hope they keep thinking about it. Because they're going to get beaten so badly," he said after being asked his thoughts on the idea of dismantling ICE. "You know ICE, these are the guys that go in and take MS-13, and they take them out. Because they're much tougher than MS-13, like by a factor of 10. And these are the ones — you get rid of ICE you're going to have a country that you're going to be afraid to walk out of your house."

Senators such as Elizabeth Warren and Kirsten Gillibrand have made comments in recent weeks saying the agency needed to be replaced all together.

"I believe that [Immigration and Customs Enforcement] has become a deportation force ... and that's why I believe you should get rid of it, start over, reimagine it and build something that actually works," Gillibrand said on Thursday.

Early Saturday morning, President Trump also praised the agency as “one of the smartest, toughest, and most spirited law enforcement groups” that he has ever seen.

These Democrats Want To Abolish ICE

By Daniel Chaitin

[Washington Examiner](#), July 1, 2018

A growing number of Democrats are calling for the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement agency to be abolished, which has coincided with fierce opposition to the Trump administration’s “zero tolerance” immigration policy.

President Trump has said the Democrats will be “beaten so badly” if they campaign on a platform of dismantling ICE, but some in the party see it as an effective rallying call.

Here is of Democrats who have said they would like to see the demise of the agency:

Sen. Elizabeth Warren: The Massachusetts senator and liberal fixture said Saturday at a rally in Boston: “We need to rebuild our immigration system from top to bottom by starting with replacing ICE with something that reflects our morality.”

Sen. Kirsten Gillibrand, D-N.Y.: Like Warren, she is a potential 2020 contender. Gillibrand decried ICE as a “deportation force” – a reference to child separation at the border that Trump officials have criticized as being inaccurately pinned on ICE. She told CNN she would like to get “rid of it, start over, reimagine it and build something that actually works.”

Rep. Mark Pocan, D-Wis.: The chair of the Congressional Progressive Caucus is working on legislation to eliminate ICE. Reps. Pramila Jayapal, D-Wash., Earl Blumenauer, D-Ore., Jim McGovern, D-Mass., Raul Grijalva, D-Ariz., and Mike Capuano, D-Mass., have indicated they would support such a bill, according to Vox.

Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez: The 28-year-old self-declared democratic socialist who defeated fourth-ranking House Democrat Joe Crowley of New York last week. She ran on a platform that includes abolishing ICE.

New York City Mayor Bill de Blasio: “ICE’s time has come and gone,” the mayor said in a radio interview on Friday.

Cynthia Nixon: The actress-turned-Democratic candidate for New York governor has called ICE a “terrorist organization” that should be abolished.

Randy Bryce. This labor organizer who is vying to take retiring House Speaker Paul Ryan’s seat in Wisconsin’s First Congressional District encouraged his

Twitter followers in April to sign their support for abolishing ICE.

50/50: Sen. Kamala Harris, D-Calif., hasn’t gone so far as to call for abolishing ICE, but did say last week that ICE should be reassessed “from scratch.”

Meanwhile, some Democrats on Saturday cautioned against the efficacy of abolishing ICE.

Sen. Tammy Duckworth, D-Ill., said on CNN that even if ICE is taken apart, the same “failed” policies will remain. There are “a lot of things we could do” before making the move to replace the agency entirely, she said.

Sen. Amy Klobuchar, D-Minn., echoed that sentiment. “I think what has to change are the policies. And the people who are making these policies are making horrendous decisions like separating kids from their parents. We are always going to need immigration enforcement,” Klobuchar said on ABC’s “This Week.” “We are a major country with major borders. To me, it’s ‘What are those policies?’”

Immigration Activists Condemn ICE, Family Detention

By Stephen Dinan And Dave Boyer

[Washington Times](#), July 1, 2018

Far from settling the family separation issue, President Trump’s executive order last month has only solidified the battle lines, with his administration saying it is left with no choice but to keep entire families detained and Democrats and liberal activists saying no illegal immigrants should be detained at all.

Believing they have seized momentum after Mr. Trump backed down on separations, those activists now say the agency responsible for detaining and deporting illegal immigrants, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, should be scrapped altogether.

The call is becoming a litmus test for Democratic candidates. It has been picked up as a rallying cry by Hollywood elites eager for another issue over which to attack the president, and on Saturday it sent tens of thousands of people into the streets in cities across the country.

Mr. Trump says it’s a losing issue for them and vowed in a series of tweets and an interview this weekend to back ICE agents and officers.

“That’s going to be their platform, open borders, which equals crime. I think they’ll never win another election, so I’m actually quite happy about it,” Mr. Trump told Fox News’ Channel’s Maria Bartiromo.

Mr. Trump ignited the debate with his zero-tolerance policy at the border, announced by the Justice Department in May, which involved jailing most border

jumpers. It was meant to send a message to migrants that crossing the border illegally would have immediate consequences.

In cases where parents came to the border with children, that meant separating them because there aren't family detention spaces in the criminal justice system.

But after massive resistance from Democrats and Republicans, religious leaders and the business community, the president relented. Two weeks ago, he signed an executive order ending most family separations.

Democrats said that was a good start but argued that he needed to go further and release illegal immigrant families into the community. Even being detained with their parents is traumatic for children, they said.

It has grown into a major movement.

On Thursday, some 630 women were arrested at one of the Senate office buildings in Washington during a protest calling for ICE to be abolished. On Saturday, tens of thousands of people marched in cities across the country with the same rallying cry.

"As a woman and as a mother, I refuse to stay silent as parents on the border are separated from their kids," said Tamika Mallory, co-chair of the Women's March, who was one of those arrested. "Our fight won't end until all mothers are reunited with their children, which is why we are demanding an end to immigrant detention once and for all."

The Trump administration has flatly rejected that option, saying it would amount to "catch and release" — when illegal immigrants are processed and released into the community on the usually false hope that they will return for their deportation hearings.

"The government will not separate families but detain families together during the pendency of immigration proceedings when they are apprehended at or between ports of entry," the Justice Department said in a filing with Judge Dolly M. Gee, who for the past few years has been the key force controlling family detention.

Polling suggests Mr. Trump's new stance is the more popular.

A YouGov/Economist survey taken just as Mr. Trump issued his executive order found just 19 percent backed the release of families on the assumption that they would return later. By contrast, 20 percent wanted family separation through arrests and jailing of parents.

But the plurality — 44 percent — backed the government's current position: that the families be held together in detention centers until their immigration hearings and then be deported or allowed to stay.

The administration also says it now has legal backing for its policy.

That is based on a complicated set of court cases. The Justice Department, in briefs filed late Friday, said a ruling last week that ordered a stop to family separation indicated that the government does have the right to keep the families detained.

The Justice Department says that ruling, known as the Ms. L case, contradicts a ruling by another federal judge in what is known as the Flores Settlement, which until now ordered that children be held in immigration detention no longer than 20 days.

"The Ms. L ruling addresses reunification of children with their parents, and specifically requires reunification 'when the parent is returned to immigration custody' after a release from criminal custody," the government said. "But this aspect of the Ms. L ruling would make little sense if that reunification would necessitate an immediate release of the parents from immigration custody under the Flores Agreement."

The turmoil for ICE comes as it loses the man who has been leading it for the past 17 months. The retirement of Thomas D. Homan, who had been acting as chief of ICE, became effective Saturday.

Homeland Security Secretary Kirstjen Nielsen announced that Ronald D. Vitiello, a former top Border Patrol official, would take over as acting chief.

Mr. Vitiello has been the acting deputy commissioner at U.S. Customs and Border Protection, ICE's sister immigration law enforcement agency, where oversaw initial construction of Mr. Trump's border wall.

Mr. Trump this weekend offered his full support for ICE.

"To the great and brave men and women of ICE, do not worry or lose your spirit," Mr. Trump tweeted. "You are doing a fantastic job of keeping us safe by eradicating the worst criminal elements. So brave! The radical left Dems want you out. Next it will be all police. Zero chance, It will never happen!"

'A Political Suicide March': Trump Aims To Inflict Political Pain On Democrats Over Calls To Abolish Immigration Enforcement Agency

By David Nakamura

[Washington Post](#), June 30, 2018

BRIDGEWATER, N.J. — President Trump on Saturday opened a new front in the immigration debate, diverting attention away from his administration's treatment of undocumented immigrants to a broader fight over the federal agency charged with detaining and deporting them.

In a pair of tweets from his private golf club in Bedminster, N.J., Trump forcefully defended the performance of Immigration and Customs Enforcement and lambasted Democrats as pushing a “radical left” agenda to abolish it, even though only a handful have publicly supported doing so.

“To the great and brave men and women of ICE, do not worry or lose your spirit,” Trump wrote in one tweet. “You are doing a fantastic job of keeping us safe by eradicating the worst criminal elements.”

In an interview on Fox News set to air Sunday, Trump suggested that the issue would hurt Democrats in the midterm elections because ICE helps eradicate violent gangs. Trump’s public support of ICE came as tens of thousands marched in cities across the country to protest a “zero tolerance” policy under which all adults who crossed the border illegally were referred for criminal prosecution, resulting in more than 2,500 children being separated from adult relatives.

“I hope they keep thinking about it because they’re going to get beaten so badly,” he told Maria Bartiromo, host of “Sunday Morning Futures.” “You get rid of ICE, you’re going to have a country that you’re going to be afraid to walk out of your house. I love that issue if they’re going to actually do that.”

Over the past week, several prominent Democrats have proposed eliminating ICE, citing what they say is its unjust treatment of immigrants. Among them were Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, the 28-year-old who upset Rep. Joseph Crowley (D-N.Y.) in a primary election Tuesday, and Sens. Kirsten Gillibrand (N.Y.) and Elizabeth Warren (Mass.).

Though other Democrats, including party leaders in the Senate and House, have not gone that far in their criticism, the debate over ICE has thrust an agency with 20,000 employees into the public spotlight after years of whiplash over the scope of its central mission since its founding in 2003.

“We need to rebuild our immigration system from top to bottom, starting by replacing ICE with something that reflects our morality,” Warren said at a rally in Boston on Saturday.

ICE, which is housed within the sprawling Department of Homeland Security, is responsible for arresting and deporting the estimated 11 million immigrants living in the country illegally. But the agency has been criticized by liberal activists for its tactics, including workplace raids and the deportation of undocumented immigrants whose children are U.S. citizens.

The Obama administration aimed to narrow ICE’s mission by targeting its limited enforcement resources to violent criminals while seeking to provide deportation

relief to others. Deportations fell from a high of 434,000 in 2013 to 344,000 in 2016 under President Barack Obama.

But Trump, who ran on a hard-line immigration platform, eased the ICE guidelines in his first week in office as his administration declared that no groups would be broadly granted exemptions to deportation laws.

The recent public outcry over the Trump administration’s policy of separating children from adults who illegally cross the border from Mexico has focused renewed attention on the treatment of immigrants at the southern border. However, it is Customs and Border Protection — a separate division under the DHS — and not ICE, that carried out the policy, sending parents to face prosecution in federal court while their children were turned over to the Department of Health and Human Services.

Trump’s policy reversal, in the form of an executive order mandating that families not be separated, has raised new questions, over how long the administration will detain families and in what conditions.

Ocasio-Cortez’s upset of Crowley, the fourth-ranking House Democrat, raised the question of whether her more liberal positions were indicative of a party shifting further to the left. Asked on CNN about her support for abolishing ICE, Gillibrand said, “I don’t think ICE today is working as intended. I believe that it has become a deportation force.”

Gillibrand suggested separating the agency’s functions under different divisions to “build something that actually works,” though she did not offer specifics.

“We should protect families that need our help and that’s not what ICE is doing today,” she said.

Yet other Democrats fear that such a position is fraught for the party as Trump continues to paint immigrants as dangerous to put his political rivals on the defensive.

“I think it’s a winning issue for him,” said Leon Fresco, an immigration lawyer who served as an aide to Sen. Charles E. Schumer (D-N.Y.) during Congress’s unsuccessful effort to pass comprehensive immigration reform in 2013-2014. “If it’s a binary choice and people think it’s the end of immigration enforcement, that’s not a good place for us to be.”

In his tweets, Trump praised ICE for working to “liberate” Long Island from the grasp of MS-13, a transnational gang. The president has twice visited that region to discuss the dangers of criminal immigrants, whom he has called “animals.”

“The radical left Dems want you out,” Trump wrote in his tweet, referring to ICE. “Next it will be all police. Zero chance, It will never happen!”

A senior White House official said the administration would be “leaning aggressively into the fight” over ICE.

“This is a political suicide march for the Democratic Party,” said the official, who spoke on the condition of anonymity to discuss internal White House thinking. “The Democrats have literally moved the immigration debate to the terrain of: Should the country enforce our immigration laws — yes or no? These are thoughts once relegated to the outermost fringes of the Democratic Party. Now there’s not one Democratic leader willing to repudiate these comments.”

One Democratic aide in the House, who was not authorized to speak on the record, called proposals to abolish ICE “stupid” and said the strategy would “play right into Trump’s hands.”

This aide said the party should focus on “the cruelty of the actions around family separations and some of the ridiculous tactics used by ICE to bully state and local governments” to comply with federal immigration detainers.

“But the ‘abolish ICE’ debate oversimplifies everything,” the aide said. “You rarely get anywhere through policymaking by hashtag.”

Alarmed by the rhetoric, the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, which has been critical of Trump’s immigration agenda, developed talking points to emphasize the “inhumane and harsh” treatment of immigrants by ICE but also stressed the importance of other functions of the agency, such as investigating cybercrime and carry out anti-drug operations, according to the Daily Beast.

Other Democratic leaders also have refrained from calling for the elimination of ICE, instead focusing on reforming the agency.

House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi (Calif.) “believes that ICE has been on the wrong end of far too many inhumane and unconstitutional practices to be allowed to continue without an immediate and fundamental overhaul,” said her spokesman, Drew Hammill.

John Sandweg, who served as acting ICE director in the Obama administration, said the fierce criticism of ICE risks further harming morale in an agency made up largely of employees who are trying to enforce the laws without a political agenda.

The anti-secrecy organization WikiLeaks released a list of names of thousands of ICE employees, along with personal information, such as phone numbers, that was collected from public databases.

On Saturday, Homeland Security Secretary Kirstjen Nielsen named Ronald D. Vitiello to serve as acting director of ICE, after the departure of interim

director Thomas Homan, who announced his resignation in the spring in the face of a stalled confirmation process in the Senate.

“The men and women of ICE are doing what they are told,” Sandweg said. Of Democrats, he added: “Their beef is not with ICE — it’s with Donald Trump.”

Donald Trump Defends ICE From Radical Left

By Charlie Spiering

[Breitbart](#), June 30, 2018

President Donald Trump defended Immigration and Customs Enforcement agents after a growing number of Democrats called for the abolishment of the agency.

“To the great and brave men and women of ICE, do not worry or lose your spirit. You are doing a fantastic job of keeping us safe by eradicating the worst criminal elements,” Trump wrote. “So brave!”

After Democratic upstart Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez beat her incumbent Democrat opponent in a primary challenge on the platform of abolishing ICE, Kirsten Gillibrand and New York City Mayor Bill de Blasio signaled support for the idea.

“The radical left Dems want you out,” Trump said to ICE agents. “Next it will be all police. Zero chance, It will never happen!”

To the great and brave men and women of ICE, do not worry or lose your spirit. You are doing a fantastic job of keeping us safe by eradicating the worst criminal elements. So brave! The radical left Dems want you out. Next it will be all police. Zero chance, It will never happen!

— Donald J. Trump (@realDonaldTrump) June 30, 2018

Donald Trump: Democrats Will Be ‘Beaten So Badly’ If They Campaign To Abolish ICE

By Ryan W. Miller

[USA Today](#), June 30, 2018

President Donald Trump said he thinks Democrats will lose future elections if they run on a platform of abolishing U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, as more liberals join the progressive call to dismantle the agency.

In an interview with Fox News set to air Sunday, Trump said Democrats will be “beaten so badly” if the party rallies around the “abolish ICE” movement that has picked up steam in recent weeks.

“Well I hope they keep thinking about it. Because they’re going to get beaten so badly,” Trump said, according to Fox News. “You know ICE, these are the

guys that go in and take MS-13, and they take them out. Because they're much tougher than MS-13, like by a factor of 10. And these are the ones — you get rid of ICE you're going to have a country that you're going to be afraid to walk out of your house."

Trump's comments come as another senator, Elizabeth Warren, D-Mass., expressed her support for replacing the agency at a Saturday rally protesting Trump's "zero tolerance" immigration policy.

"The president's deeply immoral actions have made it obvious: We need to rebuild our immigration system from top to bottom, starting by replacing ICE with something that reflects our morality and that works," Warren said.

Hundreds of thousands rallied around the USA Saturday to protest the immigration policy that resulted in more than 2,000 children separated from their parents at the U.S.-Mexico border.

More: In 50 states, thousands protest immigration policy, with focus on midterm elections

ICE has been in the center of the backlash over Trump's strict policy, which had the agency arresting undocumented immigrants entering the country without using legal entry points.

Trump signed an executive order earlier this month that aims to end the family separations while still enforcing a "zero tolerance" policy.

Two prominent New York Democrats — Sen. Kirsten Gillibrand and New York City Mayor Bill de Blasio — echoed the "abolish ICE" calls this week.

Gillibrand and de Blasio's comments came in reference to Tuesday's primary win by progressive, Democratic Socialist candidate Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, who is one of many on the left who believe the agency should be dismantled.

"If we are to uphold civic justice, we must abolish ICE and see to it that our undocumented neighbors are treated with the dignity and respect owed to all people, regardless of citizenship status," Ocasio-Cortez wrote in her campaign platform.

More: ICE on ice? Move to abolish ICE, at center of storm in immigration battle, has a long way to go

ICE spokeswoman Liz Johnson condemned calls to abolish the agency as "dangerously misguided" in a statement Friday.

"Instead of being insulted with politically-motivated attacks, the men and women of ICE should be praised for risking life and limb every day in the name of national security and public safety," Johnson said.

Trump tweeted his support of the agency Saturday morning and said there was a "zero chance" the agency would be abolished.

"To the great and brave men and women of ICE, do not worry or lose your spirit. You are doing a fantastic job of keeping us safe by eradicating the worst criminal elements. So brave!" Trump tweeted. "The radical left Dems want you out. Next it will be all police. Zero chance, It will never happen!"

Contributing: John Bacon and Doug Stanglin. Follow Ryan Miller on Twitter @RyanW_Miller

Read or Share this story: <https://usat.ly/2N7M6d3>

Thousands March Against US Immigration Policy

By Ivan Couronne

[AFP](#), June 30, 2018

Thousands of demonstrators marched in cities across the United States on Saturday against President Donald Trump's hardline immigration policy and to demand the immediate reunification of families separated at the border with Mexico.

Directly across from the White House, demonstrators filled Lafayette Square park in an atmosphere of both indignation and sadness, before marching toward the Capitol.

Boston, Chicago, Los Angeles, New York and Portland also saw crowds of protesters turn out, with celebrities including Alicia Keys and Lin-Manuel Miranda present in Washington and John Legend in Los Angeles.

"We don't believe in borders, we don't believe in walls," Sebastian Medina-Tayac, of the Piscataway Indian Nation, declared in English and Spanish at the start of the rally dubbed "Families Belong Together."

Loudspeakers broadcast the cries of a child split from relatives, as a Brazilian mother told of being separated from her own son.

"I missed nine months of his life and it should never have happened," said the woman, who only gave her name as Jocelyn. Her case dates from before the practice of separating families intensified in May.

"Shame! Shame!" the crowd responded in temperatures above 90 degrees Fahrenheit (33 Celsius).

The president could not hear the protesters' shouts, as he spent the day in Bedminster, New Jersey at the Trump National Golf Club.

There, too, protesters gathered on his motorcade route, many of them with signs about immigration policy.

"Asylum seekers are not criminals," said one.

Trump took to Twitter to defend his stance on immigration.

"When people come into our Country illegally, we must IMMEDIATELY escort them back out without going through years of legal maneuvering," he wrote.

"Our laws are the dumbest anywhere in the world. Republicans want Strong Borders and no Crime. Dems want Open Borders and are weak on Crime!"

Starting in early May, in an attempt to staunch the flow of tens of thousands of migrants to the southern US border every month, Trump ordered the arrest of adults crossing the boundary illegally, including those seeking asylum.

Many trying to cross the US-Mexico frontier are destitute, fleeing gang violence and other turmoil in Central America.

As a result of Trump's crackdown, distraught children were separated from their families and, according to widely broadcast pictures, held in chain-link enclosures, a practice that sparked domestic and global outrage.

Trump later signed an order ending the separation of families, but immigration lawyers say the process of reuniting children and their parents will be long and chaotic.

About 2,000 children remained split from their parents, according to official figures released last weekend.

– 'Not what we stand for' –

"It's thinly-veiled racism," Dorothy Carney, a 59-year-old middle school French and Latin teacher, told AFP at the Washington rally.

"The way for evil to win is for good people to do nothing. This is doing at least something."

Rita Montoya, 36, a Washington lawyer, was born in California but has Mexican origins and arrived at the protest with her two sons, aged two and four.

"We're children of immigrants," she said. "We've been putting in our dues in this country for a long time, and this country needs to start paying us some respect."

The mood was similar in New York, where Julia Lam, 58, joined the protest with two friends and their young children in strollers.

Lam is a mother and retired fashion designer who emigrated from Hong Kong in the 1980s.

"I think it's really cruel to separate kids," she said.

"I am angry. I'm very sad already with what is going on with our country. I just don't see how a human being would do such a thing."

Lawyer Courtney Malloy, 34, said it was important to show support for immigrants and that administration policies are "not America."

"This is not what we stand for and this is not okay, and we will not stand here and watch our country be torn apart and watch babies be torn from their mothers," she told AFP.

Malloy held up a sign that read: "The Only Baby Who Belongs in a Cage is Donald Trump."

Families, young people, children and the elderly – both recent arrivals and long-time citizens – all stood under a burning sun as part of a protest that a New York police officer said numbered "a couple of thousand."

"Say it loud, say it clear, refugees are welcome here," they chanted, also declaring a welcome for Muslims.

A band of drummers whipped up the fervor of a crowd, carrying signs such as "Our New York is Immigrant New York."

"Abolish ICE," read another sign, reflecting growing calls by activists for disbanding the country's frontline immigration enforcement agency.

In the Mexican border city of Ciudad Juarez, about 50 activists marched through downtown and traveled on to an international bridge, holding banners against the border wall Trump wants to build and militarization of the areas alongside it.

"Parents do not know what is happening with their children, and they are housed in unhealthy areas, in cages like dogs," said protester Jose Luis Castillo.

The protests come after the US Supreme Court on Tuesday handed Trump a major victory by upholding his ban on travelers from five primarily Muslim nations.

More than 500 women, including a member of Congress, were arrested Thursday in the US Capitol complex protesting Trump's immigration policy.

Trump has made fighting immigration – both illegal and legal – a major plank of his "America First" policy agenda.

The Immigration and Customs Enforcement agency makes arrests and otherwise enforces the administration's immigration crackdown, but an emerging coalition of politicians, activists and pro-immigrant protesters has begun calling for the agency to be dismantled.

"Occupy ICE" camps have been set up in several US states.

Trump Slams Democrats' Push To Abolish ICE

'Zero chance, It will never happen!'

By Dave Boyer

[Washington Times](#), June 30, 2018

BEDMINSTER, N.J. — President Trump hit back Saturday at Democrats' call to abolish the federal Immigration and Customs Enforcement agency, saying it will never happen on his watch.

"To the great and brave men and women of ICE, do not worry or lose your spirit," Mr. Trump tweeted. "You are doing a fantastic job of keeping us safe by eradicating the worst criminal elements. So brave! The

radical left Dems want you out. Next it will be all police. Zero chance, It will never happen!" he tweeted from his golf club in New Jersey.

The president said ICE officials are doing a vital job protecting the country.

"The Democrats are making a strong push to abolish ICE, one of the smartest, toughest and most spirited law enforcement groups of men and women that I have ever seen. I have watched ICE liberate towns from the grasp of MS-13 & clean out the toughest of situations. They are great!" he tweeted.

Some top Democrats have been increasingly calling to get rid of ICE in the wake of a furor over separation of illegal immigrant families at the southern border.

Sen. Kirsten Gillibrand, New York Democrat, has called ICE a "deportation force." New York Mayor Bill de Blasio said Friday on WYNC radio, "We should abolish ICE."

Sen. Kamala Harris, California Democrat, has said that the U.S. should consider "starting from scratch." Rep. Mark Pocan, Wisconsin Democrat, said he will introduce legislation to abolish the agency.

About a mile away from the president's golf club, about 200 demonstrators gathered along a highway to protest the president's immigration policies. They held signs proclaiming messages such as, "My civility is locked in a cage / reunite families now," "Even the Trump family belongs together," and "We the people say no to the Trump agenda" taped over a rainbow flag.

Copyright © 2018 The Washington Times, LLC.
Click here for reprint permission.

'Zero Chance' — Trump Hits Back At Calls To Abolish ICE

By Virginia Kruta

[Daily Caller](#), June 30, 2018

President Donald Trump responded to growing calls to abolish Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) on Saturday morning, saying, "Zero chance, It will never happen."

The president sent a tweet aimed at Democrats, some of whom have openly called for ICE to be reorganized or disbanded altogether. He also defended ICE's accomplishments, particularly with regard to the violent gang MS-13.

Trump followed up with another tweet promising that ICE would not be abolished on his watch.

Thus far, nine sitting members of Congress (all Democrats) have claimed that ICE need to go. Those nine are Senators Kirsten Gillibrand (NY) and Kamala Harris (CA) — who are both considered to be "in the

running" for the 2020 presidential nomination — and Representatives Mark Pocan (WI), Pramila Jayapal (WA), Earl Blumenauer (OR), Nydia Velasquez (NY), Jim McGovern (MA), Raul Grijalva (AZ) and Michael Capuano (MA).

Warren Joins Calls To Get Rid Of ICE

By Ali Breland

[The Hill](#), June 30, 2018

Sen. Elizabeth Warren (D-Mass.) on Saturday joined calls from the left to get rid of Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), saying it should be replaced with something new.

"The president's deeply immoral actions have made it obvious we need to rebuild our immigration system from top to bottom starting by replacing ICE with something that reflects our morality and that works," Warren said during a rally in Boston.

"President Trump seems to think that the only way to have immigration rule is to rip parents from their family, is to treat rape victims and refugees like terrorists and to put children in cages," she continued. "This is ugly and this is wrong and this is not the way to run our country."

The Democratic senator had last week visited a processing center in McAllen, Texas, for immigrants entering the U.S. through the southwestern border.

Warren joins a small but growing contingent of Democrats in the Senate who are calling for ICE to be abolished or replaced as the issue quickly becomes a litmus test for Democrats.

On Thursday, Sen. Kirsten Gillibrand (N.Y.) become the first sitting senator to call for ICE to be scrapped, saying the agency should be "reimagined."

Sens. Bernie Sanders (I-Vt.) and Kamala Harris (D-Calif.) have also called for the agency to be examined, but not fully abolished.

Their calls to get rid of and reform the agency come after the harsh backlash to Trump's "zero tolerance" immigration policy that has led to the separation of families illegally crossing the U.S.-Mexico border.

Dem Lawmaker: ICE Has Become A 'Rogue Agency'

By Jesus Rodriguez

[The Hill](#), June 30, 2018

Rep. Pramila Jayapal (D-Wash.) on Saturday called for a commission to investigate alternatives to the Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) agency, telling [The Hill](#) that it has become a "rogue agency."

"We need to set up a commission that looks at the alternatives to ICE and really starts to understand how

do we have these functions in a way that is accountable, transparent and humane,” Jayapal said in an interview.

The calls to dismantle ICE have picked up steam in recent days, with Rep. Mark Pocan (D-Wis.) introducing a bill in the House to abolish it.

Jayapal told The Hill she wants to see reform in the way immigration law is applied.

“The calls really are to take a rogue agency and completely get rid of it and start over — nobody’s saying ‘Don’t have the functions that are necessary for the enforcement of immigration laws,’” she said.

New York has been a bellwether of such calls, first started by immigrant rights advocacy groups but recently picked up by national figures such as Democratic House candidate Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, gubernatorial candidate Cynthia Nixon, Sen. Kirsten Gillibrand (D-N.Y.) and New York City Mayor Bill DeBlasio (D).

Rumored 2020 contenders have also decried the agency but stopped short of calling for its abolition, including Sens. Bernie Sanders (I-Vt.) and Kamala Harris (D-Calif.).

And last week, 19 ICE officials sent a letter to Department of Homeland Security Secretary Kirstjen Nielsen calling for a dissolution of the agency and a reshuffling of its authority into two new, separate agencies.

Republicans, however, have seemingly rejected the notion that ICE needs reform. President Donald Trump tweeted on Saturday there was “zero chance” of abolishing ICE.

“To the great and brave men and women of ICE, do not worry or lose your spirit,” he wrote in a tweet. “The radical left Dems want you out. Next it will be all police. Zero chance, it will never happen!”

The Hill has reached out to ICE for comment.

Trump Hits Dems Pushing To Abolish ICE: ‘They’re Going To Get Beaten So Badly’

By Ali Breland

[The Hill](#), June 30, 2018

President Trump is predicting that Democrats throwing their support behind calls to abolish Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) will face blowback at the polls.

“Well I hope they keep thinking about it, because they’re going to get beaten so badly,” Trump told Fox News’s Maria Bartiromo in an interview excerpt released Saturday.

“You know ICE, these are the guys that go in and take MS-13, and they take them out. Because they’re much tougher than MS-13, like by a factor of 10,” Trump said, referring to the international gang.

“And these are the ones — you get rid of ICE, you’re going to have a country that you’re going to be afraid to walk out of your house.”

Calls to abolish ICE had previously been limited to certain groups on the left, but the idea has gained traction among mainstream Democrats in recent days and has quickly become a de facto litmus test of a politician’s progressive chops.

The movement comes amid backlash over the administration’s “zero tolerance” immigration policy, with lawmakers pushing for the administration to quickly reunite the thousands of migrant children separated from their parents who face prosecution for illegally crossing the border.

Sen. Kirsten Gillibrand (D-N.Y.) on Thursday became the first senator to call for the scrapping of ICE, on the grounds that it has become “a deportation force.”

New York Mayor Bill de Blasio (D) continued on Friday, saying, “We should abolish ICE.”

Sen. Elizabeth Warren (D-Mass.) joined the chorus of ICE critics on Saturday, calling for “replacing ICE” while slamming the White House’s “ugly” immigration practices.

Democratic socialist Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, who defeated longtime Democratic Rep. Joseph Crowley (N.Y.) in a stunning primary upset on Tuesday, had made the position of abolishing ICE a staple of her upstart campaign.

Earlier on Saturday morning, Trump addressed growing calls to abolish ICE in a pair of tweets, saying they had “zero chance.”

“The Democrats are making a strong push to abolish ICE, one of the smartest, toughest and most spirited law enforcement groups of men and women that I have ever seen. I have watched ICE liberate towns from the grasp of MS-13 & clean out the toughest of situations. They are great!” he tweeted.

“To the great and brave men and women of ICE, do not worry or lose your spirit,” he wrote in a follow-up tweet.

Trump Doubles Down Amid Protests: Illegal Border Crossers Must Be Deported ‘Immediately’

By Max Greenwood

[The Hill](#), June 30, 2018

President Trump doubled down Saturday on his demand that people who cross into the U.S. illegally be deported immediately, declaring that American immigration laws are “the dumbest anywhere in the world.”

"When people come into our Country illegally, we must IMMEDIATELY escort them back out without going through years of legal maneuvering," Trump tweeted while at his golf club in Bedminster, N.J., for the weekend.

"Our laws are the dumbest anywhere in the world. Republicans want Strong Borders and no Crime. Dems want Open Borders and are weak on Crime!"

When people come into our Country illegally, we must IMMEDIATELY escort them back out without going through years of legal maneuvering. Our laws are the dumbest anywhere in the world. Republicans want Strong Borders and no Crime. Dems want Open Borders and are weak on Crime!— Donald J. Trump (@realDonaldTrump) June 30, 2018

His comments came as tens of thousands of people gathered in Washington, D.C., and cities across the country on Saturday to protest the Trump administration's immigration policies, particularly its "zero tolerance" approach that has led to thousands of migrant children being separated from their parents at the U.S.-Mexico border.

Trump's demand in his tweet Saturday afternoon also resembled the president's previous claim this week that immigrants caught crossing the border illegally be immediately deported without due process.

The Trump administration has come under fire in recent weeks for the separation of migrant families, prompting the president to sign an executive order allowing children and parents to be detained together.

But under a 1997 consent decree, minors cannot be detained for longer than 20 days, leaving it unclear how the government plans to enforce the president's executive order.

Congress also rejected a compromise immigration bill on Wednesday that sought to address the family separations, among other issues. Lawmakers could still act on a narrower measure ending the separations.

The government was also ordered this week by a federal judge in San Diego to move quickly to reunite migrant families that had been separated, but it's not clear how officials plan to meet the deadline for doing so imposed by the court.

Trump Asserts He Didn't Push House GOP On Immigration

By Ken Thomas

[Associated Press](#), June 30, 2018

BERKELEY HEIGHTS, N.J. (AP) — President Donald Trump claimed Saturday that he never pushed House Republicans to vote for immigration bills that

failed last week, offering his latest display of whiplash on the legislation.

Trump tweeted from his New Jersey golf club that he didn't press GOP lawmakers to support the plans because it wouldn't have cleared the Senate. He wrote that he released many House Republicans "prior to the vote knowing we need more Republicans to win in Nov."

But the president's statement contradicted his commentary three days ago in which he tweeted that House Republicans should approve the "STRONG BUT FAIR" bill even though Democrats wouldn't allow it to pass the Senate. A week earlier, he urged Republicans to stop wasting their time on the bill until after the elections.

Trump's tweets were another twist in Republicans' efforts to adopt changes to the nation's immigration laws in the aftermath of highly publicized images and cries from young immigrant children being separated from their parents at the southern border. Trump's statements coincided with people across the country marching Saturday in opposition to his immigration policies.

The GOP-led House soundly rejected a wide-ranging immigration bill last week despite Trump's endorsement, a vote that followed the defeat on a harder-right package that garnered more conservative support.

GOP leaders are considering an alternative that would focus narrowly on preventing the government from separating children from migrant families caught entering the country without authorization. But any changes are not expected to happen before the July 4th holiday as lawmakers attempt to agree on bill language.

The issue has also been complicated by a federal judge who ordered that divided families be reunited with 30 days. Republicans have been working on legislation that would keep migrant families together by lifting a court-ordered, 20-day limit on how long families can be detained.

Trump issued an executive order reversing his own family separation policy, but around 2,000 children have been removed from their relatives, prompting an outcry for action.

The president tweeted Saturday that when people enter the nation illegally, "we must IMMEDIATELY escort them back out without going through years of legal maneuvering. Our laws are the dumbest anywhere in the world."

Copyright 2018 Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten, or redistributed.

Trump Falsely Claims He Never Told House Republicans To Vote For Immigration Bill

By Brent D. Griffiths
[Politico](#), June 30, 2018

President Donald Trump falsely claimed on Saturday that he never encouraged House Republicans to vote for an immigration bill, despite tweeting such an encouragement three days earlier.

"I never pushed the Republicans in the House to vote for the Immigration Bill, either GOODLATTE 1 or 2, because it could never have gotten enough Democrats as long as there is the 60 vote threshold," the president wrote on Twitter. "I released many prior to the vote knowing we need more Republicans to win in Nov."

Trump explicitly called for Republicans to support Virginia Rep. Bob Goodlatte's bill on Wednesday with an all-caps Twitter endorsement.

"HOUSE REPUBLICANS SHOULD PASS THE STRONG BUT FAIR IMMIGRATION BILL, KNOWN AS GOODLATTE II, IN THEIR AFTERNOON VOTE TODAY, EVEN THOUGH THE DEMS WON'T LET IT PASS IN THE SENATE," Trump wrote on Twitter before the Wednesday vote. "PASSAGE WILL SHOW THAT WE WANT STRONG BORDERS & SECURITY WHILE THE DEMS WANT OPEN BORDERS = CRIME. WIN!"

At the time, House Republicans were trying to gather votes to pass a compromise bill that they were hoping would draw support from both conservatives and moderates in their conference. The proposal was expected to fail beforehand and did so by an overwhelming 121-301 vote.

Trump's position on the bill wavered several times before it even came to a vote, with the president at one point saying he wouldn't sign the bill. He also said last week that the Republicans' bill wouldn't pass the Senate. By Wednesday he had tweeted his support.

The president's reversal Saturday comes as he has sent a number of tweets during his weekend in New Jersey, ranging from news about his Supreme Court appointment to thoughts on progressive outrage over the Immigration and Customs Enforcement Agency and even encouragement to buy former White House press secretary Sean Spicer's new book.

Trump is in Bedminster for the weekend with his family, although he may mix in some work with possible interviews with people on his shortlist for Supreme Court seat.

Protesters Flood US Cities To Fight Trump Immigration Policy

By Ellen Knickmeyer
[Associated Press](#), June 30, 2018

WASHINGTON (AP) — They wore white. They shook their fists in the air. They carried signs reading: "No more children in cages," and "What's next? Concentration Camps?"

In major cities and tiny towns, hundreds of thousands of marchers gathered Saturday across America, moved by accounts of children separated from their parents at the U.S.-Mexico border, in the latest act of mass resistance against President Donald Trump's immigration policies.

Protesters flooded more than 700 marches, from immigrant-friendly cities like New York and Los Angeles to conservative Appalachia and Wyoming. They gathered on the front lawn of a Border Patrol station in McAllen, Texas, near a detention center where migrant children were being held in cages, and on a street corner near Trump's golf resort at Bedminster, New Jersey, where the president is spending the weekend.

Trump has backed away from family separations amid bipartisan and international uproar. His "zero tolerance policy" led officials to take more than 2,000 children from their parents as they tried to enter the country illegally, most of them fleeing violence, persecution or economic collapse in their home countries.

Those marching Saturday demanded the government quickly reunite the families that were already divided.

A Brazilian mother separated from her 10-year-old son more than a month ago approached the microphone at the Boston rally.

"We came to the United States seeking help, and we never imagined that this could happen. So I beg everyone, please release these children, give my son back to me," she said through an interpreter, weeping.

"Please fight and continue fighting, because we will win," she said.

The crowd erupted.

In Washington, D.C., an estimated 30,000 marchers gathered in Lafayette Park across from the White House in what was expected to be the largest protest of the day, stretching for hours under a searing sun. Firefighters at one point misted the crowd to help people cool off.

Lin-Manuel Miranda, creator of the musical "Hamilton," sang a lullaby dedicated to parents unable to sing to their children. Singer-songwriter Alicia Keys read a letter written by a woman whose child had been taken away from her at the border.

"It's upsetting. Families being separated, children in cages," said Emilia Ramos, a cleaner in the district, fighting tears at the rally. "Seeing everyone together for this cause, it's emotional."

Around her, thousands waved signs: "I care," some read, referencing a jacket that first lady Melania Trump wore when traveling to visit child migrants. The back of her jacket said, "I really don't care, do U?" and it became a rallying cry for protesters Saturday.

"I care!! Do you?" read Joan Culwell's T-shirt as she joined a rally in Denver.

"We care!" marchers shouted outside Dallas City Hall. Organizer Michelle Wentz says opposition to the Trump administration's "barbaric and inhumane" policy has seemed to transcend political lines.

"This is the issue crossing the line for a lot of people," said Robin Jackson, 51, of Los Angeles, who protested with thousands carrying flags, signs and babies.

Singer John Legend serenaded the crowd and Democratic politicians who have clashed with Trump had strong words for the president, including U.S. Rep. Maxine Waters who called for his impeachment.

The president took to Twitter amid the protests, first to show his support for Immigration and Customs Enforcement as some Democrats called for major changes to the agency. Tweeting Saturday from New Jersey, Trump urged ICE agents to "not worry or lose your spirit" and wrote that "the radical left Dems want you out. Next it will be all police."

He later tweeted that he never pushed House Republicans to vote for immigration overhaul measures that failed last week, contradicting a post three days ago in which he urged GOP congressional members to pass them.

In Trump's hometown of New York City, another massive crowd poured across the Brooklyn Bridge in sweltering 90-degree heat, some carrying their children on their shoulders, chanting, "Shame!" Drivers honked their horns in support.

"It's important for this administration to know that these policies that rip apart families — that treat people as less than human, like they're vermin — are not the way of God, they are not the law of love," said the Rev. Julie Hoplamazian, an Episcopal priest marching in Brooklyn.

Though seasoned anti-Trump demonstrators packed the rallies, others were new to activism, including parents who said they felt compelled to act after heart-wrenching accounts of families who were torn apart.

Marchers took to city parks and downtown squares from Maine to Florida to Oregon; in Alaska, Hawaii and Puerto Rico; on the international bridge between El Paso, Texas, and Juarez, Mexico; even in Antler, North Dakota, population 27. Some of the demonstrations were boisterous, others were quiet.

Five people were arrested outside an ICE office in Dallas for blocking a road. At least one arrest was made in Columbus, Ohio, when protesters obstructed a downtown street. Light-rail service temporarily shut down in Minneapolis as thousands of demonstrators got in the way of the tracks. A rally in Portland, Maine, grew so large that police had to shut down part of a major street.

But in Dodge City, Kansas, a 100-person rally led by a Catholic church felt more like a mass than a protest.

In rural Marshalltown, Iowa, about 125 people gathered for a march organized by Steve Adelmund, a father of two who was inspired after turning on the news on Father's Day and seeing children being separated from their families and held in cages.

"It hit me in the heart. I cried," he said.

"If we can't come together under the idea of 'Kids shouldn't be taken from their parents,' where are we?" he asked. "We have to speak out now while we can, before we can't."

Drum beats and horns sounded as thousands of protesters took to the streets of San Francisco.

"We came here to let the president know that this is not acceptable," said San Francisco resident Barry Hooper, who attended with his wife and two daughters.

His 7-year-old daughter Liliana clutched a sign she made, saying, "Stop the separation."

Three thousand miles away in Washington, protesters ended their march at the white-columned Justice Department. They stacked their protest signs, written in English and Spanish, against its grand wooden doors.

"Fight for families," one sign demanded.

Associated Press reporters Susan Montoya Bryan in Albuquerque, New Mexico; Emily Schmall in McAllen, Texas; David Warren and Ryan Tarinelli in Dallas; Paul Elias in San Francisco; David Sharp in Portland, Maine; Martha Irvine in Chicago; Sarah Betancourt in Boston; Damian Dovarganes in Los Angeles; Rick Callahan in Indianapolis; Bob Lentz and Ron Todt in Philadelphia, Claire Galofaro in Louisville, Kentucky, and Julie Walker and Michael Sisak in New York City contributed to this report.

Copyright 2018 Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten, or redistributed.

Protesters Across U.S. Call On Trump To Reunite Immigrant Families

By Lesley Wroughton And Jason Lange

[Reuters](#), June 30, 2018

Full-text stories from Reuters currently cannot be included in this document. You may, however, click the link above to access the story.

Open Borders Protesters Target 2018: 'Vote Them Out'

By Michelle Moons

[Breitbart](#), June 30, 2018

Hundreds of open borders protesters in Washington, DC, on Saturday joined in chants of "vote them out" amid protest signs that took clear aim at the 2018 midterm elections.

"Vote them out" chants rang out many times over the course of several hours at one of many leftist open borders protests on Saturday. The "Keep Families Together" protests rallied people under the brand "Families Belong Together," targeting children separated from adults at the U.S. southern border when those groups cross illegally over the border.

The call to "vote them out" was one of several themes observed at the D.C. location on Saturday. It was echoed in many of the signs held high over the crowd.

"So much for traditional family values, vote out the GOP!" read one of the signs that swung high near another with an image of the Statue of Liberty holding President Donald Trump by the hair in the same hand as her torch.

Signs called on people to vote our Republicans in the 2018 midterm elections and showed a variety of anti-Trump images (Credit: Michelle Moons/Breitbart News)

"Impeach, indict, imprison, Trump & Co. Vote the GOP out," read another.

Sign calling for the impeachment, indictment, and imprisonment of President Donald Trump "& Co." and for people to vote Republicans out. (Credit: Michelle Moons/Breitbart News)

"Come November we'll remember," read a sign with what appeared to be the same photo of a little girl not separated from her mother that appeared on the cover of TIME magazine. Next to the image of the little girl was the image of a voting booth.

Sign urges people to vote and displays images of the little girl never separated at the border and a voting booth. (Credit: Michelle Moons/Breitbart News)

One group of protesters held printed signs marked by the National LGBTQ Task Force. "Stop detention and deportation of LGBTQ immigrants," read one of their signs. "Dismantle white supremacy," read another.

Leftist groups the Answer Coalition and National Nurses United were represented as signs bearing their branding were raised high.

Chants of "shame" arose often during speeches given at the main location for the event. Chants were directed toward the Trump administration, Republicans, and the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

Follow Michelle Moons on Twitter @MichelleDiana

Thousands March In Washington In Wilting Heat To Protest Trump's Immigration Policy

By Marissa J. Lang, Julie Zauzmer And Hannah Natanson

[Washington Post](#), June 30, 2018

The rally began with drums and a reminder that the story of most Americans began somewhere else.

A representative of the Piscataway Indian Nation addressed a crowd of thousands assembled in Lafayette Square on Saturday in Spanish, then English. Sebastian Medina-Tayac burned tobacco, a Native American prayer tradition, said a prayer and then sang an indigenous-language song from Bolivia that means, "take courage."

"We don't believe in borders. We don't believe in walls," Medina-Tayac said.

The rally ended with a march past the White House and the Trump International Hotel and on to the Department of Justice, where protesters affixed signs to the building gates:

"We are better than this," one said.

"Las familias merecen estar unidos," said another, which translates to "Families deserve to be united."

Starting around 9 a.m., thousands had made their way to Lafayette Square, with many more filling in along 16th Street and into Farragut Square, areas that had been blocked off in anticipation of 50,000 protesters' arrival in the District.

The crowd seemed somewhat shy of that, although organizers said aerial photographs indicated it was still in the tens of thousands.

About 750 similar "Families Belong Together" rallies were planned throughout the country in every state — from big cities such as Boston, Chicago and New York to tiny ones such as Antler, N.D., which has a population of 27.

The message: End President Trump's "zero tolerance" immigration policy, which has split children from their parents and detained families crossing the southern U.S. border.

With temperatures hovering in the 90s in downtown Washington, organizers made repeated calls to the crowd to drink water and use sunscreen. About two hours into the rally, several demonstrators received medical attention after apparently falling ill from the heat. A few hundred yards from the stage, at the intersection

of Jackson and H streets NW, a firetruck began spraying its hose into the air, cooling off the crowd. Children attending the march with their parents streamed into the spray.

There were many immigrants in the crowd — some whose families came long ago and others much more recently arrived. Several near the stage cheered and shouted “Bienvenidos,” or “Welcome,” as one of the latter, a woman named Jocelyn, took the microphone early in the day.

Jocelyn, who did not give her last name, said she came to the United States with her son from Brazil in August of last year. That’s when it happened to her, she said: The two were separated.

Held in a detention facility in Texas, Jocelyn did not know where her child was for two months, she said. Authorities at the facility told her he could be relinquished for adoption, she said, as gasps came from the crowd.

“I spent many days sick and without hope,” she said in Spanish. “I wanted to join this fight to get my son back and for all the mothers who are suffering so far away from their children.”

It took nine months to be reunited with her son, she said.

At each mention of the government, Border Patrol agents or the Trump administration, the crowd erupted into chants of “shame, shame, shame.” Later, as they passed the Trump International Hotel, protesters booed and chanted “vote him out.”

Rep. John Lewis (D-Ga.) and Sens. Elizabeth Warren (D-Mass.) and Kamala D. Harris (D-Calif.), attended rallies in their home states. In New York City, marchers heckled the headquarters for U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, known as ICE, as they passed. Demonstrators in Kentucky gathered outside Republican Sen. Rand Paul’s Bowling Green office, and massive crowds in Chicago chanted “sí, se puede” — yes, we can.

Some protesters held signs calling for the dissolution of ICE, a recent rallying cry of lawmakers and immigration-rights groups. But that was not the purpose of Saturday’s march, organizers said.

“We have three main demands,” said Anna Galland, executive director of MoveOn.org, which co-sponsored the event. “Reunite families now, end family internment camps, and end the zero-humanity policy that created this humanitarian crisis and chaos in the first place.”

Several celebrities, including Lin-Manuel Miranda, the creator of the musical “Hamilton,” singer-songwriter Alicia Keys and actor America Ferrera, lent their fame to the protest.

Miranda, who walked out to screams from the Washington crowd, said simply: “We’re here because there are parents right now who can’t sing lullabies to their kids. I’m just going to sing a lullaby that I wrote.”

He sang, a cappella, a song from his megahit show in which founding-father characters Aaron Burr and Alexander Hamilton sing to their newborn children during the Revolutionary War.

Keys and Ferrera, herself the child of Honduran immigrants, read letters from parents and grandparents separated from children.

Later, a tearful 12-year-old from Florida named Leah, whose mother is undocumented, told the crowd that she is afraid every day that the government could take her mother away from her. She sobbed as she recalled the stress of her daily life, not knowing whether today or tomorrow would be the day her family is confronted by immigration officials.

She struggles to concentrate, to sleep, to do homework.

“I don’t understand why they are being so mean to us children,” the girl said. “Don’t they know how much we love our families? Don’t they love their families, too?”

The list of nearly 30 speakers in Washington included a Holocaust survivor, who was separated from her mother for two years while the two were in hiding, and a survivor of a U.S. internment camp for Japanese Americans who was taken from his mother for three weeks because he was ill and would not be allowed into the same camp as his family.

Actor Diane Guerrero cried as she recalled the deportation of her Colombian parents and the struggle she and her brother have faced since.

They all said the separations affected them and their relationship with their families for the rest of their lives.

“We have been this way before, and we mustn’t forget,” the Rev. Traci Blackmon of the United Church of Christ said. “History says remember. History says love always wins. . . . We are standing on the side of love.”

The crowd that stood, listening, was full of families, mothers and children with homemade signs and T-shirts, hand-drawn and finger-painted.

In the midst of it all, an infant sat on a parent’s shoulders, red words written on the back of his onesie: “Ni una mas.” Not one more.

Florencia Fuensalida and John Van Zandt, who have both worked for years with immigrants, admitted that they have not told their 3-year-old son Bastian why they are marching today, but they have practiced chants with him: We respect everybody. We love our friends.

"Immigrants are coming here to survive," Fuensalida said. "Then they get here, and they get ripped of the only thing they have, their families."

At seven months pregnant, no one would have blamed Caitlin Crowl for sitting out the nearly two-mile walk or the 90-plus-degree day — but, she said, she wasn't going to let any of that stop her from attending this rally.

"This is one baby I can take care of, but there are thousands of others that aren't being taken care of, who don't have a voice," said Crowl, 28.

The bulk of the protest took place on a stage assembled just across the street from the White House, symbolism organizers relished. But President Trump was not there. He was scheduled to spend the weekend at his golf club in Bedminster, N.J.

Still, that did not discourage speakers from name-checking the president in their remarks or protesters from making the trek to Washington to be seen in his backyard.

Lexi and Mya Thompson, sisters from Phoenix, Ariz., said they decided to attend Saturday's protest in the middle of a family vacation with their mother because of the president's rhetoric on immigrants.

Lexi and Mya, who at 19 and 17 are both studying at Arizona State University, said being from Arizona, they were particularly troubled by Trump's assertions that "border cities" are unsafe, plagued by criminals who cross the border illegally from places like Mexico.

"Living there, I know that's not true," Lexi said. "We live miles away from the border. Nothing happens. I feel safe in my city."

Her sister nodded and took a sip from her pink water bottle, readjusting her grip on a sign reading, "AMERICA, DO BETTER."

Protesters, led by organizers from MoveOn.org, the National Domestic Workers Alliance, the American Civil Liberties Union and other groups, were joined by Rep. Pramila Jayapal (D-Wash.), who earlier in the week had been arrested along with nearly 600 others in a sit-in at the Hart Senate Building.

"I see this, as my colleague John Lewis would say, as good trouble," Jayapal said in an interview before the march. "I see standing up against horrible, inhumane policies and not allowing my name to be linked to this to be just as important as standing up for the good things that the government does."

One protester from Alabama said he had traveled 11 hours alone to be in Washington on Saturday because he felt the country was on the wrong path. In his hands, he held the Bible and an American flag, hung upside down on its post.

"We're in distress," said Garrick Rawls, 32. "This is what distress looks like."

Reis Thebault, Miela Fetaw, Perry Stein and Amy Zahn contributed to this report.

Thousands Gather In DC To Protest Trump Immigration Policies

By Maya Lora

[The Hill](#), June 30, 2018

Tens of thousands of people flooded downtown Washington, D.C., on Saturday in protest of the Trump administration's immigration policies as President Trump doubled down on his pledge to "IMMEDIATELY" deport those who enter the U.S. illegally.

On a hot day with temperatures reaching over 90 degrees, protesters crowded Lafayette Square across from the White House at a rally that was as much a protest against the president himself as it was against the recent rise in migrant family separation cases.

Protesters blasted the administration's recently ended practice of separating and detaining migrant children away from their parents while the adults face prosecution, with chants such as "What do we want? Families together! When do we want it? Now!" and "No hate, no fear, immigrants are welcome here."

The "Families Belong Together" event was hosted primarily by a coalition formed by the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, the National Domestic Workers Alliance and the liberal activist group MoveOn.

The protest in D.C. was joined by more than 700 events planned at cities across the country on Saturday, according to organizers, with major marches in New York, Los Angeles and other cities such as Boston attracting various lawmakers and public figures.

Trump took a defiant tone in a tweet amid the protests on Saturday afternoon, writing, "When people come into our Country illegally, we must IMMEDIATELY escort them back out without going through years of legal maneuvering."

"Our laws are the dumbest anywhere in the world. Republicans want Strong Borders and no Crime. Dems want Open Borders and are weak on Crime!" Trump tweeted while at his golf club in Bedminster, N.J., for the weekend.

Saturday's protests were organized to fight three main tenets: family separation policies, family detention policies and the zero-tolerance policy started under Trump that drove the uptick in children separated from their parents at the border.

Organizations also demanded that the president reunite all separated children with their parents within the

deadlines assigned by a California federal judge earlier this week.

"We want people to be reunited but then not detained at all," Ashley Allison, the executive vice president of protests and campaigns for The Leadership Conference, said in a phone interview. "And then not deported either, for that matter."

Protesters were instructed to attend the event dressed in all white in order to demonstrate a united front.

"We're hoping to send a strong message to the administration that we will not allow for these atrocities and attacks on children and families to continue and that we are broad and united across many geographies and experiences in this country," Ai-jen Poo, director at the National Domestic Workers Alliance, said in a phone interview. "This is a moment for everyday people to take back the country."

Protesters used a variety of signs on Saturday to criticize the administration's immigration policies, with a number of signs playing on the president's signature campaign slogan, turning it into phrases such as "Immigrants Make America Great" and "Make America Nice Again."

Also featured were mockeries of first lady Melania Trump's controversial jacket that she wore en route to a child detention facility in Texas earlier this month. Painted onto a variety of green T-shirts and jackets was a variation of the phrase "Of course I care – don't you?"

Immigrant voices were highlighted throughout the day's official programming. An asylum speaker from Brazil at the center of an ACLU legal case appeared in an ankle bracelet alongside her son. She read her story in Spanish in pieces to be translated by an interpreter.

She and other speakers at the event were met with potent chants from the crowd, such as, "We see you, we love you!"

Religious leaders were also brought to the forefront of the day's scheduled events.

Rev. Traci Blackmon, who pastors a church in Florissant, Mo., fired up the crowd by ripping the Trump administration and the Supreme Court for a number of recent controversial decisions.

She also pushed back on officials invoking specific Bible verses to support certain policies, something Attorney General Jeff Sessions was recently criticized for doing.

"What we are witnessing at our borders with black and brown families today is not who America has become – this is who America has always been!" she declared to a cheering crowd, with some responding, "Call them out!"

As she finished her remarks on each printed page in front of her, Blackmon would throw them to the ground.

"People of faith must not be silent in the face of a god that we do not serve!" Blackmon continued. "Our silence will not save us, my friends. When our leaders use Scripture to legislate hate, they do not speak on behalf of God."

Celebrity appearances at the rally included actress America Ferrera, singer Alicia Keys, actress Diane Guerrero and "Hamilton" creator Lin-Manuel Miranda, who sang a song from his acclaimed Broadway musical.

He said he would keep singing lullabies until parents separated from their children were able to sing their own lullabies to them again.

After the scheduled events ended, protesters marched from the White House to the Justice Department, where many people laid their signs in front of the doors to the building. Some continued on toward the National Mall.

"People are starting to realize this is the kind of moment that we are going to read about in the history books as a moral atrocity and our children are going to ask us what we did to help," Poo said.

Dem Lawmakers Join Nationwide Protests Against Trump Immigration Policies

By John Bowden

[The Hill](#), June 30, 2018

Various Democratic lawmakers joined tens of thousands of protesters at rallies across the country on Saturday to protest the Trump administration's separation of migrant children from their parents for detention.

Immigration and civil rights activists descended on downtown Washington, D.C., for a main rally on Saturday while more than 700 "sister" rallies occurred in cities and towns around the U.S. and in several cities around the world, according to organizers and social media posts.

Maryland Sen. Ben Cardin (D) attended a rally in Baltimore, tweeting photos from the march showing dozens of protesters holding signs aimed at the president and others assembled to hear featured speakers from the American Civil Liberties Union ACLU and other organizations.

We're gathered here in #Baltimore to say that #FamiliesBelongTogether... and we need to reunite children with their parents now. pic.twitter.com/FXfwtmFzhK— Senator Ben Cardin (@SenatorCardin) June 30, 2018

Massachusetts Sen. Elizabeth Warren (D) joined a rally in Boston where she ripped the administration's "ugly" immigration practices and called for Immigration and Customs Enforcement to be replaced.

NEW —> Sen. Elizabeth Warren Joins The Abolish ICE Movement <https://t.co/oOrvKonWCW>— Alex Smith (@AlexandraCSmith) June 30, 2018

Also spotted at the Boston rally were fellow Massachusetts lawmakers Sen. Ed Markey (D) and Rep. Joe Kennedy III (D), who also addressed the crowd.

Ed Markey and Joe @RepJoeKennedy in Boston....

Wouldn't it be awesome if these two were POTUS and VP???

We wouldn't be having a protest against inhumane immigration policies...

I hate Trump and his cronies more than ever right now.... pic.twitter.com/DD0de3Ms4P— Kim M. (@Blacklace40) June 30, 2018

In Atlanta, civil rights icon Rep. John Lewis (D-Ga.) called on a crowd to commit "good trouble, necessary trouble" to put an end to Trump's "zero tolerance" immigration policy, which led to the family separation crisis Trump sought to halt in an executive order last week.

"The world is crying with us," Lewis told the crowd. "We must show the world that we are better than what is going on in America today."

"We may have to turn American upside down to turn it right-side up," Rep. John Lewis says at immigration march in Atlanta. pic.twitter.com/T9FVBotWU— MSNBC (@MSNBC) June 30, 2018

At the main protest in D.C., Rep. Pramila Jayapal (D-Wash.) addressed the crowd and spoke to The Hill about her arrest alongside immigration protesters earlier in the week.

"I was proud to be arrested with them," she said. "The Trump administration is doing this and I as a Congress member, a representative of the United States government, refused to allow my name to be used in that way."

A press release from organizers of the D.C. rally said that 30,000 protesters had gathered in the nation's capital as of 11:30 a.m. on Saturday, with thousands more attending rallies in cities across the U.S.

"When these groups came together for the first time a few weeks ago we set out to not just galvanize the usual suspects, but to recognize that everyone has a role in fighting for the country that we want," said Ai-Jen Poo, executive director of the National Domestic Workers Alliance and one of the rally's organizers.

"Today's event is not the culmination but the start of activating people from all walks of life, in every state to fight for the soul of American values."

Celebrities Show Their Support For #FamiliesBelongTogether Marches

By Brooke Seipel

[The Hill](#), June 30, 2018

Celebrities joined activists across the country on Saturday at protests against the Trump administration's immigration policies.

The "Families Belong Together" protest was hosted by a number of groups including the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, the National Domestic Workers Alliance and the liberal activist group MoveOn.

The goal of the protests was to demand action by the Trump administration and lawmakers to stop migrant family detention policies.

More than 700 events were planned in cities across the U.S., according to organizers. Marchers took to the streets in New York, Los Angeles and Boston among other places.

Celebrities including Lin-Manuel Miranda, Alicia Keys and Amy Schumer were among those who attended events.

Here are some of the celebrities who showed their support for the marches and turned out to protest:

We're not backing down. #familiesbelongtogether

A post shared by America Ferrera (@americaferrera) on Jun 30, 2018 at 10:56am PDT

#familysbelongtogether nyc @alysiareiner @kerrywashington @padmalakshmi

A post shared by @ amyschumer on Jun 30, 2018 at 10:21am PDT

Let's put an end to this madness. Find a march near you and donate to @RaicesTexas. #FamiliesBelongTogether #KeepFamiliesTogether #EndFamilySeparation

A post shared by Julia Louis-Dreyfus (@officialjld) on Jun 29, 2018 at 11:53am PDT

Chrissy Teigen: "I'm incredibly proud to be a daughter of an immigrant." pic.twitter.com/rCXsl4zCY5— Steve Saldivar (@stevesaldivar) June 30, 2018

Proud to march with my #BigLittleLies family! #familiesbelongtogetherLA pic.twitter.com/ilof6ldzDJ— Laura Dern (@LauraDern) June 30, 2018

I couldn't imagine you ever being taken from me... #familiesbelongtogether #MotherSon #Love #children #Priceless #nomuslimban #endzerotolerance #savethesupremecourt #VOTE

pic.twitter.com/nmtFXDmBMH— Alicia Keys
(@aliciakeys) June 30, 2018

#KeepFamiliesTogetherMarch

pic.twitter.com/A1kOTMEuXZ— Patton Oswalt
(@pattonoswalt) June 30, 2018

WATCH: Portland Police Declare Riot, Revoke Protest Permit As Sides Clash

By Warner Todd Huston

[Breitbart](#), July 1, 2018

Police in Portland, Oregon, revoked a permit for a pro-America march and declared the scene a riot when counter-protesters erupted in violence on Saturday.

Officers in riot gear deployed flash-bang grenades and sprayed tear gas to break up the dueling crowds as protesters launched fireworks and threw eggs, bottles and other items at each other, according to KATU in Portland.

The initial permit was secured by the Patriot Prayer group that had planned a march entitled the “Freedom and Courage” rally. But a large number of members of a local violent, black-clad Antifa group also gathered along the march route and began a series of confrontations with the marchers.

The Rose City Antifa, held a counter-rally it called the “Defend PDX: Patriot Prayer’s Violence Must End” rally. A spokesman for Rose City said, “it is very important that antifascists keep up the pressure so that we can stop them once and for all.”

The Rose City group apparently did not have a permit.

Police waded in quickly, revoked the permit, and began clearing the area of both sides once the violence began.

The rally began with the prayer group’s permitted march from Portland’s Terry Schrunk Federal Plaza. The event was organized by activist Joey Gibson, a U.S. Senate candidate for Washington and leader of Patriot Prayer.

The AntiFa group organized some distance away but not before police seized weapons such as utility knives, clubs and chemical sprays, according to The Oregonian.

Despite the confiscations, the AntiFa group initiated hostilities by throwing eggs, bottles, and other items at the Patriot group, the paper noted.

Officers reported witnessing incidents of assault and soon revoked the Patriot group’s permit and began forcing both groups to leave the area.

Antifa activists left graffiti in their wake according to Twitter users:

Graffiti in downtown Portland

— PDX Mike Bivins (@itsmikebivins) June 17, 2018

Wild brawl, explosions, beatings at the Patriot Prayer rally and march.

— PDX Mike Bivins (@itsmikebivins) July 1, 2018

One video from the streets shows members of Antifa clearly throwing objects at the Patriot Prayer group before both sides erupt in a rumble.

This angle clearly shows Antifa started it by throwing bottles, eggs, and m80s. Make sure this footage stays off the internet. #Portland
pic.twitter.com/FzOaA962en

— Beverly Hills Antifa (@BevHillsAntifa7) July 1, 2018

Police arrested four, but the charges lodged against them were all for previous incidents and outstanding warrants. Three of the four were later released after processing.

Follow Warner Todd Huston on Twitter
[@warnerthuston](#).

How ‘Abolish ICE’ Went From Social Media To Progressive Candidates’ Rallying Cry

By Sydney Ember And Astead W. Herndon

[New York Times](#), June 29, 2018

Abolish ICE!

That was the seemingly radical message that Chardo Richardson, a House candidate in Florida, published in an online statement four months ago, endorsing a call to eliminate the Immigration and Customs Enforcement agency.

“Immigrants are some of the most courageous and industrious people humanity has to offer,” he wrote in an introduction to the immigration platform of Brand New Congress, a grass-roots progressive organization. “We can only benefit from their presence.”

To that point, the idea had largely been passed around on social media; among political candidates, Mr. Richardson was something of a lonely voice. But in the months since — as startling images emerged from the border of migrant children separated from their parents — the call to abolish or defund the agency has gained momentum in the midterm campaigns. Case in point: the shocking victory on Tuesday by an insurgent primary candidate in New York, Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, who had made abolishing ICE a part of her platform.

From Massachusetts to Hawaii, progressive candidates undeterred by the immense obstacles to eliminating a federal agency have peppered Twitter with hashtags of support. Deb Haaland, a Native American who stunned the New Mexico political establishment with a House victory early this month, supports the idea. A

Florida candidate, Matt Haggman, cut a campaign ad promising to “close ICE down.” Cynthia Nixon, who is running for governor in New York, has called the immigration agency a “terrorist organization.”

“We should abolish ICE,” Mr. Richardson said in an interview this week, with the conviction of a politician who believes he has a winning idea. “ICE is terrorizing our communities.”

Political strategists point out the political risk inherent in the movement: that Republicans will use it to portray Democrats as extremists who are weak on border control. “The other side is using the slogan to communicate to the country that this is a debate about open borders,” said Cecilia Muñoz, former director of the White House’s Domestic Policy Council under President Obama.

Still, the idea has been gaining momentum as a rallying cry of the far left, and Ms. Ocasio-Cortez’s upset victory over an establishment Democrat gave it a newfound political currency. Then, on Thursday night, just hours after hundreds of immigration protesters had chanted “abolish ICE” on Capitol Hill, Kirsten Gillibrand became the first sitting senator to directly support the agency’s elimination.

“I believe you should get rid of it, start over, reimagine it and build something that actually works,” The New York Democrat said on CNN. She later shared the message on Twitter.

It was a powerful gesture, coming from a prominent Democrat who is also considered a possible 2020 presidential contender, and one that could inspire more high-profile politicians to back the idea. (New York City Mayor Bill de Blasio added his support Friday morning.) Notably, Senator Gillibrand had backed Ms. Ocasio-Cortez’s opponent, Democratic stalwart Joseph Crowley, in the primary.

The call to abolish ICE remains a largely rhetorical, activist position with questionable feasibility. Top Democratic leaders have not adopted the position, and only a handful of other sitting politicians have embraced it to this point.

But fueled by continued anger over the crisis at the border, the movement to abolish ICE is taking hold as an important policy issue for the Democratic Party’s progressive wing. Driven more by their ideology than any concrete political calculus, a small but rising number of progressive candidates are unabashedly pushing the proposal.

Some Democrats point to other progressive proposals that were once similarly dismissed by party leaders but have since gained traction among mainstream Democrats, like Medicare for all and tuition-free public college. The hope among grass-roots

activists is that progressive energy will give these same people the political cover to embrace an abolish-ICE policy that has mostly thrived on the fringe.

“ICE operates through the tactics of fear, violence and intimidation, with questionable legality, and tears families apart,” Stephanie Taylor, a founder of the liberal organization Progressive Change Campaign Committee, said in a statement. “We applaud the growing number of progressives who are calling for an end to this terror.”

Their ICE proposal, these progressives hope, could also help galvanize voters in the summer’s remaining primaries and November’s general elections. Some of those who support the position said in interviews that they were especially encouraged by Ms. Ocasio-Cortez’s victory.

But while the movement is gaining strength, it has also drawn attention from the right, which has seized on it to bludgeon the Democrats.

In an interview on Wednesday with Politico, Senator Mitch McConnell of Kentucky, the majority leader, referred to the Democratic Party as “self-avowed socialists” who wanted “open borders.”

Kellyanne Conway, the White House counselor, has also sought to use the progressive rallying against Democrats.

“Every Democratic candidate could be asked now, maybe, ‘Do you agree or disagree with the new face of the Democratic Party that we should abolish Immigration and Customs and Enforcement?’” Ms. Conway said Wednesday on Fox News.

Still, there are indications the proposal is reverberating in the halls of Washington. This week, Representative Mark Pocan of Wisconsin said he planned to introduce legislation to abolish the immigration agency. In an interview, he said that he had received support for the bill from fellow Democratic House members including Pramila Jayapal of Washington, Earl Blumenauer of Oregon and Jim McGovern of Massachusetts.

“I think that you will see more support for it just because this really gets at addressing the core abuses by the administration,” Mr. Pocan said.

Little polling exists on whether Americans support the complete shuttering of ICE’s operations, but recent data does show that President Trump’s nativist push to limit both legal and illegal immigration is at odds with public opinion. A Pew Research Center poll released Wednesday said that about 70 percent of Americans want legal immigration to at least stay at its present level, but more Americans support its increase than its decrease. A Quinnipiac University poll of American voters found that 50 percent of Americans think the

Trump administration has been too aggressive in deportations.

One potential problem is that the abolish-ICE movement could further divide the Democratic Party as it looks to project a unified message heading into the midterms and, beyond that, the 2020 presidential campaign. Eliminating a federal agency is a position that leaves little room for compromise, and moderate Democrats who do not support the proposal risk drawing the ire of the very vocal far left, which already views the party establishment as slow to embrace their ideals.

Strategists and legal experts say the position could also be difficult to pass, especially if it continues to be a partisan issue.

"It would require us to think about immigration policy from a very different perspective, but I think it is possible," said Sameera Hafiz, a senior political strategist at the Immigrant Legal Resource Center.

Supporters of abolishing ICE are vocal, their call magnified by social media, but they have offered few concrete plans. Mr. Pocan of Wisconsin said his bill would create a commission that would examine ICE to determine which of its roles should be performed by other agencies.

At this point, however, the issue is still largely the province of the far reaches of the far left. Even progressives do not agree on the elimination proposal.

"I don't know that abolishing ICE solves anything," said Veronica Escobar, a progressive who is running for Congress in Texas's 16th district, which lies along the Mexican border. "The fact of the matter is that ICE does do some things that are necessary to keep the country safe."

Ms. Escobar cited in particular ICE's work investigating child predators and human trafficking, a point she echoed in a lengthy Facebook post.

The obstacles to eliminating ICE do not deter groups like Brand New Congress, the grass-roots organization that included abolishing the agency in its November 2017 immigration platform, and has encouraged young social activists like Ms. Ocasio-Cortez and Mr. Richardson of Florida to run for federal office.

The group's education materials cite the enormous fiscal burden of immigration enforcement, and also assert that other government agencies can do the watchdog work of immigration enforcement with clearer oversight.

Ms. Ocasio-Cortez's victory has only energized the effort.

"As long as progressives keep winning elections and keep pushing the issue and refuse to let the issue of abolishing ICE go, it will become a bigger issue for

Democrats," said Sarah Smith, who is running for Congress in Washington. "This is just another one of those issues where we have to strong-arm them into listening to us."

Nobody Knows How 'abolish ICE' Plays Politically

By David Weigel

[Washington Post](#), June 29, 2018

On Thursday night, Sen. Kirsten Gillibrand (D-N.Y.) called for the elimination of Immigration and Customs Enforcement, or ICE. By Friday morning, Republican campaign groups were asking whether Democrats who had taken money from Gillibrand — a number of female candidates in swing races — would echo the senator or denounce her.

"Do they stand with Gillibrand and want to do away with our immigration enforcement agency?" asked America Rising.

"Expect more Senate Democrats to trip over themselves in an effort follow Gillibrand's swing to the radical left," said the Republican National Committee.

The implication was that the abolition of ICE, a demand that started with left-wing activists and writers, would be a killer wedge issue against moderate Democrats. And so far, the idea is being endorsed only by left-wing Democrats — among them Rep. Mark Pocan (Wis.), New York Mayor Bill De Blasio, and congressional candidate Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez (N.Y.).

But we do not really know what voters think of ICE, a government organization that is only 15 years old. We know that voters favor "border security," a term that can be defined in many ways — including support for ICE.

But we also know that many voters have not been impressed by immigration enforcement decisions made by the Trump administration.

In a September 2017 Washington Post/ABC News poll, when asked whether the administration had been "too tough" in enforcing immigration laws, 45 percent of responding voters said yes; 30 percent said they were satisfied. In the only recent poll of any kind that asked voters about ICE — a Harvard Institute of Politics survey of 18-29-year-olds in March — just 25 percent of young voters trusted ICE to "do the right thing" all or most of the time. By comparison, 51 percent said they trusted the military, and 38 percent said they trusted the Environmental Protection Agency.

That was before the drawn-out family-separations crisis, which transformed "abolish ICE" from a cause for opponents of "mass deportation" to a simple way for

Democrats to criticize immigration enforcement in the Trump era.

The “abolish” language was serious — campaigners want ICE gone — but it was always inspired by conservative efforts to degrade branches of the government by suggesting they be abolished entirely. In 2012 and 2016, multiple Republican candidates for president ran on abolishing the Internal Revenue Service, the EPA and the Department of Education. The latter agency is included in a Trump administration government reform plan, albeit one unlikely to make it through Congress.

Just as “abolish the IRS” campaigners imagine some form of revenue collection to replace it, “abolish ICE” campaigners follow the hooky slogan with several replacement proposals. Ocasio-Cortez has told multiple interviewers that an idealized, post-ICE government would continue to police the border and enforce immigration law. Ocasio-Cortez described this at greatest length last month in an interview with the Intercept.

Before ICE we had the INS. So we had the Immigration and Naturalization Services. There are very intense operations that we do need to monitor. We have to keep tabs on human trafficking, child sex trafficking, child pornography and, of course, just standard immigration in and out. And so the INS had handled that before. And so criminal investigations will get forwarded to the Department of Justice which had the infrastructure to kind of handle those proceedings, and then there are other investigatory arms, either within the FBI or within Health and Human Services that would handle those different pockets.

Now when the Department of Homeland Security was established, it concentrated and centralized all of those things into one. And those operations in and of themselves can continue. You know, you can have Border and Customs do the things that they have always done.

The one line that I do want to draw is that when I started talking about this over the weekend it kind of recently blew up, and I’m starting to see, particularly, other congressional candidates say: “Let’s return to the INS.” And that I want to make sure is not correct either.

This is not about going back to the INS. This is really about, in some ways, we need to go all the way back to the root of our immigration policy to begin with, which the very first immigration policy law passed in the United States was the Chinese Exclusion Act in the 1800s, and so the very bedrock of U.S. immigration policy, the very beginning of it was a policy based on racial exclusion. And I think that we need to really reimagine our immigration policy based around two

things like I had said before, foreign policy and criminal justice and additionally our economic goals as well. And we really kind of need, I think, to reimagine our immigration services as part of an economic engine, as part of an accommodation to our own foreign policy aims and, where necessary, enforcement of serious crimes like human trafficking and so on.

So abolishing ICE doesn’t mean get rid of our immigration policy, but what it does mean is to get rid of the draconian enforcement that has happened since 2003 that routinely violates our civil rights, because, frankly, it was designed with that structure in mind.

That’s a complicated answer that’s at home in a podcast, but not in a campaign ad — which is what’s really being discussed when Gillibrand-endorsed candidates are asked whether they want to “abolish ICE.” Without polling, many Democrats have admitted that the politics of this are nettlesome; the Congressional Hispanic Caucus has provided talking points on ICE which do not call for abolition. That suggests the risk for Democrats if they get behind the “abolish” campaign and are not ready for tough questions.

None of the Democrats who have climbed out on this limb, however, have been making it a litmus test for their party. There is an understanding that the scandal of family separations has created an opening on immigration: Where restrictionists would like to talk about gangs and crime, reformers can talk about children and families. Characterizing ICE as a failing experiment that is enforcing the law incorrectly allows reformers to explain how it should be enforced. The Trump administration frames criticism of ICE as an “open borders” stance, but Democrats expect to be hit with the “open borders” club no matter what they say. The president pushes the envelope; Democrats would like to push it back.

Scott Clement contributed to this report.

Abolish ICE Calls Expose Democrats Ideological Split

By Dave Boyer And Valerie Richardson

[Washington Times](#), July 2, 2018

Democrats have found themselves at odds over whether to abolish Immigration and Customs Enforcement in the latest rift between the party’s liberal and leftist wings.

Democratic Sens. Richard Blumenthal of Connecticut and Tammy Duckworth of Illinois insisted that eradicating ICE would accomplish nothing as long as President Trump is in power, breaking with progressives who have called for replacing the agency.

"Abolishing ICE will accomplish nothing unless we change the Trump policies," said Mr. Blumenthal on "Face the Nation."

Ms. Duckworth said the agency "reflects the policies of the White House, of the president."

"You abolish ICE now, you still have the same president with the same failed policies," Ms. Duckworth told CNN's "State of the Union." "Whatever you replace it with is still going to reflect what the president wants to do."

She indicated that Democrats would be better served focusing on Mr. Trump, who signed a June 20 executive order ending family separations at the border.

"I think there's a lot of other things we can do before we get to that point, first of which is you've got someone in the White House who has these horrendous policies which he still hasn't fixed," said Ms. Duckworth. "Families are still separated, children are still in cages, nursing babies are still separated from their moms."

Their stances contrasted with those of several top Democrats who have recently jumped on the "abolish ICE" bandwagon, siding with protesters at Saturday's Families Belong Together rallies who chanted "Abolish ICE!" and "chinga la migra," which translates to "f*** the border patrol."

"The president's deeply immoral actions have made it obvious: We need to rebuild our immigration system from top to bottom, starting by replacing ICE with something that reflects our morality," Ms. Warren told a crowd at Boston City Hall Plaza.

The protests, which drew thousands to events in more than 600 cities, were sponsored by progressive groups including the Women's March, the American Civil Liberties Union, Indivisible, MoveOn.org, and United We Dream.

Another potential 2020 Democratic presidential contender, Sen. Kirsten Gillibrand, New York Democrat, said Friday in a Facebook post that "We need to abolish ICE," arguing that it has become "a cruel deportation force."

"Congress needs to abolish ICE, and we need to start over, separating the criminal justice and immigration roles," Ms. Gillibrand said.

New York City Mayor Bill de Blasio said in a Friday radio interview on WNYC that "ICE's time has come and gone," adding that, "We should abolish ICE. We should create something better, something different."

Sen. Kamala Harris, California Democrat, hasn't ruled out the idea, saying in interviews that the government may want to "start from scratch" on immigration enforcement.

Pushing back was President Trump, who said Sunday that Democrats would "never win another election" if they keep up the anti-ICE rhetoric.

"I hope they keep thinking about it. Because they're going to get beaten so badly," Mr. Trump told Fox News' Maria Bartiromo. "You get rid of ICE, you're going to have a country that you're going to be afraid to walk out of your house. I love it that they're going to actually do that."

Sen. Dick Durbin Calls ICE 'A Group Of Incompetents'

By Mike Brest

[Daily Caller](#), July 1, 2018

Democratic Senator Dick Durbin hurled insults towards the Immigration and Customs Enforcement agency during an immigration rally in Illinois Sunday morning.

"Look at ICE, what a group of incompetents. At this point they're focused more on toddlers than terrorists. They want to, instead of deporting felons, they're deporting families that are being persecuted by criminal gangs," Durbin stated.

"They can either listen today, or they're going to hear the message in November," he added when asked about the message he wanted to send to his congressional colleagues. "I think the American people will speak loudly."

The Illinois senator has joined the list of Democrats who have recently developed hostile views towards ICE.

New York congressional hopeful Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez and governor candidate Cynthia Nixon were some of the first to call for its abolition. Both Massachusetts Senator Elizabeth Warren and New York Senator Kristen Gillibrand have also called for similar.

Poll: 3-in-4 Swing Voters Oppose Democrat Plan To Abolish ICE

By John Binder

[Breitbart](#), July 1, 2018

The vast majority of swing voters across the United States oppose the Democrats' latest plan to abolish all immigration enforcement by ending the Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) agency.

In recent weeks, Democrats in the House and Senate, along with progressive liberals like Cynthia Nixon in New York and most recently insurgent Democrat candidate for Congress, Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, have been demanding ICE be abolished and all immigration enforcement be ended. House Democrats are now crafting legislation that would officially abolish ICE.

The latest Harvard/Harris Poll, though, reveals that swing voters are overwhelmingly opposed to the Democrats' plan to end all immigration enforcement across the U.S.

Nearly 3-in-4 swing voters, about 73 percent, of swing voters said they do not want ICE to be disbanded. Less than 30 percent of swing voters said they support the abolishment of ICE.

Likewise, Americans in general oppose the Democrats' plan to abolish ICE. Nearly 70 percent of Americans polled in the Harvard/Harris Poll said they do not support ending ICE and thus all immigration enforcement.

Abolishing ICE, as Breitbart News reported, would have allowed more than 1.6 million illegal aliens to have gone free throughout the U.S. in the last five years.

"If Democrats had their way and ICE been abolished five years ago, there would have been at least 1.64 million illegal aliens — many of which are convicted criminals — released into U.S. neighborhoods and communities rather than being deported." <https://t.co/ob3KciHcnW>

— John Binder June 28, 2018

As Breitbart News reported, Democrats lost support in the 2018 midterm elections in battleground districts after weeks of opposing all immigration enforcement and promoting an agenda that ends all border enforcement.

Americans overwhelmingly support ending illegal immigration and reducing legal immigration levels, at which more than 1.5 million immigrants are admitted to the U.S. every year. The majority of swing voters say they oppose importing more foreign workers to compete against Americans for jobs.

Meanwhile, nearly two out of three Americans say they support reducing legal immigration, and more Americans support zero immigration to the U.S. than current legal immigration levels. More than four in nine in black Americans in swing districts across the country say immigration has made life "worse" in America.

John Binder is a reporter for Breitbart News. Follow him on Twitter at @JxhnBinder.

Likewise, Americans in general oppose the Democrats' plan to abolish ICE. Nearly 70 percent of Americans polled in the Harvard/Harris Poll said they do not support ending ICE and thus all immigration enforcement.

Abolishing ICE, as Breitbart News reported, would have allowed more than 1.6 million illegal aliens to have gone free throughout the U.S. in the last five years.

"If Democrats had their way and ICE been abolished five years ago, there would have been at least 1.64 million illegal aliens — many of which are convicted

criminals — released into U.S. neighborhoods and communities rather than being deported." <https://t.co/ob3KciHcnW>

— John Binder June 28, 2018

As Breitbart News reported, Democrats lost support in the 2018 midterm elections in battleground districts after weeks of opposing all immigration enforcement and promoting an agenda that ends all border enforcement.

Americans overwhelmingly support ending illegal immigration and reducing legal immigration levels, at which more than 1.5 million immigrants are admitted to the U.S. every year. The majority of swing voters say they oppose importing more foreign workers to compete against Americans for jobs.

Meanwhile, nearly two out of three Americans say they support reducing legal immigration, and more Americans support zero immigration to the U.S. than current legal immigration levels. More than four in nine in black Americans in swing districts across the country say immigration has made life "worse" in America.

DHS NEWS

DHS Chooses Vitiello To Lead Immigration And Customs Agency

[Associated Press](#), June 30, 2018

WASHINGTON (AP) — The Department of Homeland Security says Ronald D. Vitiello will serve as deputy director of the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement and also take on the role of ICE's acting director.

Vitiello currently serves as acting deputy commissioner of the U.S. Customs and Border Protection. He will lead ICE as the Trump administration deals with scrutiny over the separation of immigrant children from their relatives at the U.S. southern border.

Vitiello is a 30-year veteran of law enforcement and was tapped to lead ICE after President Donald Trump's pick, Thomas Homan, took himself out of the running and said he'd retire this summer.

Homan has been acting director since Trump took office and has overseen a surge in deportation arrests while advocating for Trump's crackdown on illegal immigration.

Copyright 2018 Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten, or redistributed.

Top Border Patrol Official To Serve As Acting Director Of Immigration And Customs Agency

By Ron Nixon

[New York Times](#), June 30, 2018

WASHINGTON — Ronald D. Vitiello, a senior Border Patrol official, will serve as acting director of the Immigration and Customs Enforcement agency, the Trump administration announced on Saturday, in a move that comes amid calls by some activists and politicians for the agency to be abolished.

Mr. Vitiello currently serves as the acting deputy commissioner of Customs and Border Protection, and previously served as the chief of the Border Patrol.

He will replace Thomas D. Homan, the current acting head of ICE, who retired this month. The Senate must approve a full-time director for ICE, with Mr. Vitiello now viewed as the leading candidate.

"I am pleased that ICE will continue to be led by an experienced and well-respected career law enforcement officer who will be a strong advocate for the agency's work force," Kirstjen M. Nielsen, the homeland security secretary, said in a statement announcing the appointment.

Mr. Vitiello's elevation to lead the immigration agency comes at a critical juncture.

Numerous Democrats have called for abolishing the agency and protesters across the country have rallied in front of ICE regional offices and its national headquarters.

The agency has been criticized for the arrest of undocumented immigrants dropping their children off at school, and for detaining and deporting those who have been arrested for minor offenses.

The new leader of the agency must also deal with internal divisions.

About two weeks ago, 19 Immigration and Customs Enforcement investigators wrote to the homeland security secretary seeking to dissolve the agency, concerned that the Trump administration's "zero tolerance" crackdown on illegal immigrants had limited their ability to pursue national security threats, child pornography and transnational crime.

The special agents proposed creating a stand-alone investigations unit and another agency to handle immigration detention and deportation.

Collapse

SEE MY OPTIONS

Vitiello Tapped As Acting ICE Director

By Margaret Talev

[Bloomberg News](#), June 30, 2018

Ronald Vitiello is the new acting director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, the Trump administration said, as President Donald Trump looks to

fine tune his "zero-tolerance" policy on illegal immigration.

Vitiello is a career Border Patrol official who's been serving since April 2017 as acting deputy commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection. He's being named the deputy director of ICE and will also will serve as its acting director, Homeland Security Kirstjen Nielsen said in a statement on Saturday.

It wasn't clear from Nielsen's statement if or when the administration would seek to confirm a permanent director to ICE. Vitiello succeeds Thomas Homan, who retired as acting director on Friday after a short but controversial tenure. Homan was nominated for the position in November, but his nomination was withdrawn in the spring without a Senate confirmation hearing. He announced in April he planned to retire.

Homan's retirement comes as the administration faces an international backlash over a policy that has separated parents and children caught crossing the border without documentation, and reunite those families.

Trump, in a pair of Twitter messages on Saturday morning ahead of the announcement, accused Democrats of wanting to abolish the agency – a handful do, and want a new agency in its place – and following that, "all police," and concluded, "Zero chance." "Liberate Towns"

Trump said he'd watched the agency "liberate towns from the grasp of" the street gang MS-13, without specifying which towns. "Do not worry or lose your spirit," Trump told ICE agents.

"I am pleased that ICE will continue to be led by an experienced and well-respected career law enforcement officer who will be a strong advocate for the agency's workforce," Nielsen said in the statement, citing Vitiello's more than 30 years of experience.

Nielsen praised Homan has having helped lift employee morale at the agency to its highest level since 2010.

The announcement came on a day thousands of protesters took to the streets in U.S. cities from Washington to San Francisco to oppose the Trump administration's family separations at the border.

U.S. immigration laws "are the dumbest anywhere in the world," Trump said Saturday on Twitter.

Lifelong Border Patrol Agent Ronald Vitiello Picked To Lead ICE

By Anna Giaritelli

[Washington Examiner](#), June 30, 2018

Ronald Vitiello, acting deputy commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, has been picked to

head U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement after the Saturday retirement of Acting Director Thomas Homan, according to an internal email sent to Department of Homeland Security personnel Saturday.

"I am pleased to announce that Ronald D. Vitiello has been named the Deputy Director for U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), effective Saturday, June 30. As of today he will also take on the role as the Acting Director of U.S. ICE," DHS Sec. Kirstjen Nielsen wrote in an email.

President Trump is expected to formally nominate Vitiello in the coming week, a Department of Homeland Security official told the Washington Examiner.

Vitiello has served in his current CBP role since April 2017, and he previously led U.S. Border Patrol as its chief operating officer for a year. He signed on as a Border Patrol officer 34 years ago and has worked in Texas, Arizona, Washington, D.C., and Vermont.

Vitiello, 54, started his federal career within the Department of Homeland Security in 1985 at Border Patrol's Laredo Station within the Laredo Sector in south-central Texas. The Chicago native began working his way through the ranks and in 1997 became deputy assistant regional director of Border Patrol's Central Region Office in Dallas.

In 2007, Vitiello was transferred down to the Rio Grande Valley Sector in South Texas to serve as chief patrol agent of what is now the country's highest-traffic sector for illegal immigration. He oversaw 12,000 Border Patrol personnel in that role.

He served as Border Patrol deputy chief from 2010 through July 2016 then was promoted to the executive assistant commissioner of operations support.

Homan announced in the spring that he would retire in late June. He originally retired in January 2017, but was asked by then-DHS Secretary John Kelly the day of his retirement party to stay on until a replacement could be found. Homan agreed.

A replacement was never found and Homan told DHS leadership this past January he intended to leave his post in June.

"At the same time, we must bid farewell to the current Acting Director of ICE, Tom Homan. Acting Director Homan has been a part of the DHS community since he entered on duty as a Border Patrol Agent more than 30 years ago," Nielsen wrote. "Acting Director Homan will be greatly missed in his well-earned (second) retirement. We wish Tom and his family all the best and know they will remain part of the DHS family."

If confirmed, Vitiello, who is second-in-command of a 60,000-person agency will technically be taking a promotion to fully oversee ICE's 20,000 personnel. He'll also be joining ICE in the midst of a turbulent time in the

agency's existence as politicians and candidates continue to call for it to be abolished.

But Homan told the Washington Examiner in a phone call Thursday the current controversy is "ridiculous."

Last month, ICE came under fire when Attorney General Jeff Sessions said all illegal immigrants who were apprehended entering the U.S. between ports of entry, including first-time illegal entrants who arrived with children, should be referred from CBP to the Justice Department for prosecution.

Minors were subsequently turned over to the Department of Health and Human Services who would then place them with a parent or family friend in the U.S. until the parent who brought them into the country either had his or her charges dropped or served jail time.

Over the last two weeks, groups advocating for the migrant families have held protests outside ICE offices over this issue, including outside ICE's Washington headquarters on Wednesday, and marches in various cities. Organizations have called for families to be reunited and ICE to be abolished.

But Homan said his agency, which handles deportations and homeland security investigations, is not relevant to this specific issue.

"I think a lot of the public is misinformed," he said. "For instance, you shouldn't be protesting ICE about family separation because that happens on the border."

Homan added he was "not vilifying Border Patrol," but attempting to explain that public frustration against ICE was being wrongly directed.

Controversial ICE Chief Retiring, Replacement Named

By Tal Kopan

[CNN International](#), June 29, 2018

Washington (CNN)Immigration and Customs Enforcement chief Tom Homan is serving his last day Friday as the controversial face of the Trump administration's crackdown on illegal immigration retires.

Homan's final day was confirmed by spokeswoman Liz Johnson.

The polarizing face of the administration's immigration enforcement, and a favorite of President Donald Trump himself, Homan had announced in April he would be taking his long-delayed retirement this month.

Homan has told the story of receiving the request to stay on as chief of ICE under Trump while celebrating at his going away party – a retirement that was deferred for a year and a half.

On Saturday, Homeland Security Secretary Kirstjen Nielsen announced that acting CBP Deputy Commissioner Ronald Vitiello would take over as acting director of ICE in Homan's stead.

Vitiello "brings to ICE the vision and leadership needed to continue the exceptional work the agency is doing to accomplish its crucial national security and public safety missions," Nielsen said in a statement.

"I am pleased that ICE will continue to be led by an experienced and well-respected career law enforcement officer who will be a strong advocate for the agency's workforce," she added.

A source familiar with the situation had told CNN that Vitiello was expected to be named acting director of ICE as soon as Friday.

Vitiello has been a familiar face for the media as well, often speaking with reporters about the President's border wall project.

Homan had been able to serve temporarily in the role since the beginning of the Trump administration, despite never being confirmed by the Senate, because he had already been the deputy in line for the job. But since Vitiello comes from a different agency, it's likely that federal law would prevent him from serving in the role in an acting capacity while also nominated to the Senate for the permanent position.

Homan was nominated for the position in November, but his nomination was withdrawn in May, never having a confirmation hearing.

Nielsen said that under "his exceptional leadership, the men and women of ICE have made significant progress in restoring the rule of law to our immigration system and countering criminals such as human smugglers and those attempting to exploit children."

Any nomination in the Senate would likely be highly contentious, as ICE has been the main focus of criticism regarding the President's aggressive immigration agenda.

New Acting ICE Head Named As Agency Continues To Be Criticized

By Brent D. Griffiths

[Politico](#), June 30, 2018

Homeland Security Secretary Kirstjen Nielsen on Saturday announced the new acting director of Immigration and Customs Enforcement, an agency that has become a pariah among some progressives and Democratic lawmakers who have in recent weeks said it should be abolished.

Nielsen named Ronald D. Vitiello, currently the acting deputy commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, as both the deputy director and acting

director of ICE. Vitiello's new roles are effectively immediately.

"Deputy Commissioner Vitiello brings to ICE the vision and leadership needed to continue the exceptional work the agency is doing to accomplish its crucial national security and public safety missions," Nielsen said in a statement accompanying the announcement.

Vitiello will replace Thomas Homan, the current acting director of ICE, who retires this month. Senate Democrats' intense opposition stalled Homan's confirmation after the White House nominated him November to become the agency's director.

According to the release, Vitiello has been a part of the larger homeland security field for more than three decades, starting out as a border patrol agent.

The appointment comes at a critical time in ICE's history. After agitation from progressive activists, a number of Democratic lawmakers are pushing to abolish ICE, an agency that was created in the wake of the September 11 attacks.

Sen. Kirsten Gillibrand (D-N.Y.) tweeted Thursday that ICE "has become a deportation force."

President Donald Trump has delighted in the political fracas over the agency, seeking to portray calls to rein in ICE as overly extreme and indicative of a less stringent approach to immigration enforcement. He wrote on Twitter Saturday that the "radical left" wants ICE agents out.

"To the great and brave men and women of ICE, do not worry or lose your spirit," Trump tweeted. "You are doing a fantastic job of keeping us safe by eradicating the worst criminal elements. So brave!"

Senior Border Patrol Official Tapped To Serve As Acting ICE Director

By Brett Samuels

[The Hill](#), July 1, 2018

The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) announced Saturday that Ronald Vitiello will serve as the new acting director of Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) as the agency grapples with fresh criticism from lawmakers and activists.

Vitiello is the current acting deputy commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, and has served as a senior Border Patrol agent for several years. He will replace acting ICE Director Thomas Homan, who announced his retirement earlier this year.

"Deputy Commissioner Vitiello brings to ICE the vision and leadership needed to continue the exceptional work the agency is doing to accomplish its crucial national security and public safety missions," DHS Secretary Kirstjen Nielsen said in a statement.

Homan announced in April that he planned to retire at the end of June, citing “family and personal considerations.”

Vitiello will take over as ICE is front and center in the Trump administration's efforts to crack down on illegal immigration.

The agency has faced scrutiny in recent weeks for its role in the administration's “zero tolerance” policy, which led to the separation of thousands of migrant children from their parents.

Protests have broken out near ICE facilities in New York City, Washington, D.C., and Portland, Ore., in recent days, prompting the agency to put up barriers near entrances or after immigration hearings.

A growing number of Democrats have in recent days called for ICE to be abolished, and for a new agency to be started from scratch. Other lawmakers have expressed skepticism, saying some agency needs to fulfill ICE's function.

President Trump has fiercely defended the agency, claiming protesters want “anarchy,” and are endangering ICE agents. He has slammed Democrats repeatedly for their views on immigration.

With ‘Head Held High,’ Exiting ICE Chief Thomas Homan Wants Trump To Do Even More

By Anna Giaritelli

[Washington Examiner](#), July 1, 2018

Outgoing chief of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Thomas Homan, wants President Trump to get tougher on Congress and pressure them into finally funding the 10,000 additional ICE employees he ordered be hired in an executive order a year and a half ago.

“I would like President Trump to work with Congress to get our needed resources. We need money to do our job,” Homan told the Washington Examiner during his final days in office. “The president has tried. He talked about giving us 10,000 more officers. We haven't seen that happen yet because Congress hasn't funded it.”

Homan, who retired Saturday from his post as acting director of the Department of Homeland Security agency, said the Republican leader should also push lawmakers to ban local jurisdictions from not cooperating with ICE agents' requests to detain illegal immigrants already in custody.

“I'd like to see the president work with Congress to get rid of sanctuary cities because sanctuary cities are a danger to the American people,” he added. “I hope the

president works with [DHS] Secretary Nielsen to finish what we started.”

Homan hopes his successor continues to “enforce the law” to the same extent his officers have carried it out since Trump's January 2017 order.

Trump's action mandated ICE carry out all existing immigration laws whereas former President Barack Obama had instructed ICE to prioritize who it went after.

“It's just a fact that our sitting president of one year has made a big difference,” he said. “I've worked for six presidents. I started with Ronald Reagan ... No one has done more for border [safety], public safety, and law enforcement than President Trump.”

The 34-year law enforcement veteran's departure comes just as some Democratic lawmakers and political candidates have escalated calls to abolish ICE.

“It's insulting that a member of Congress would say ‘abolish ICE’ when we're enforcing the laws that Congress enacted. They give us a set of laws that we're supposed to enforce and they give me the money to do it, then say ‘abolish ICE,’” Homan explained. “We're doing what you told us to do.”

Although the agency is embroiled in a battle over the future of ICE, Homan said he's leaving with his “head held high.”

“I'll be handing my badge and gun in. It's going to be tough. It's a life-changing moment for me. I've known this place — I've known these people longer than I've known my wife and children,” he added. “My dad was a cop, grandfather a cop. I'm lucky cause when I was a little boy, 8-9 years old, I wanted to be a cop. I lived my dream.”

BORDER WALL

Texas School District OKs Possible Border Wall Land Survey

[Associated Press](#), July 1, 2018

RIO GRANDE CITY, Texas (AP) — A school district in a small Texas border city is letting the federal government review some of its land that could be used for border wall construction.

The Rio Grande City school board this week approved a request from U.S. Customs and Border Protection to come onto district property for survey and site assessment.

School board president Daniel Garcia told The Monitor newspaper in McAllen that federal officials didn't specify the reason for the assessment. Texas congressman Henry Cuellar says he met last week with U.S. officials who informed him they're moving forward with trying to acquire land.

Rio Grande City is in Starr County, which in April confirmed meeting with government officials about wall construction.

Other cities have also received requests from Border Patrol to survey land.

Information from: The Monitor,
<http://www.themonitor.com>

Copyright 2018 Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten, or redistributed.

Border Patrol Agent: Trump's Wall Is The Best Way To End To The Humanitarian Crisis On Our Southern Border

By Brandon Judd

[Fox News](#), June 29, 2018

If Democrats and the media elite truly cared about the safety of illegal immigrants, they'd be down on the border right now working to build the wall President Trump wants America to have.

As a veteran Border Patrol agent, I know firsthand that a secure border with the big beautiful wall the president is building is the only humane and permanent solution to the crisis at the border.

Despite Democratic obstruction, President Trump is building the wall now, and he will play hardball with Congress to ensure that the necessary funding to complete the wall is secured. Without a completed wall, thousands of illegal immigrants will continue to put their lives at risk.

As long as people think they can cross the border illegally, they will continue to try. The journey is dangerous enough due to the natural conditions alone. Traveling hundreds or even thousands of miles on foot, often in extreme heat and without adequate water, is no easy trip for an adult – let alone for a child.

But those who try to cross our southern border illegally are subject to much worse than just the elements – they are at the mercy of brutal criminal gangs. The illegal immigrant smuggling trade is dominated by predatory “coyotes” connected to Mexico’s worst drug cartels. They care little for the lives of their human cargo. These are the sorts of people who don’t think twice before leaving illegal immigrants to die in locked trailers under the desert sun.

The coyotes’ control of human smuggling across the border results in routine violence, theft, and death, as well as the widespread rape of Central and South American women and girls.

A 2014 Huffington Post report stated that 80 percent of illegal immigrant women and girls are raped during their travel.

In addition to discouraging illegal border crossings and protecting desperate migrants from violence, rape and death, securing the border will save American taxpayers vast amounts of money. It will also free up the resources necessary to expedite legal immigration and review the ever-growing backlog of asylum claims.

According to a 2017 study, the presence of illegal immigrants and their 4.2 million kids costs Americans roughly \$135 billion in taxes at the federal, state, and local levels. That’s a tax burden of roughly \$8,075 per illegal alien family member. Another recent report revealed that the federal government spent \$1.4 billion just housing illegal immigrant unaccompanied minors, which works out to \$670 per unaccompanied minor per day.

President Trump is only requesting an additional \$25 billion to complete his border wall – a one-time cost that is minor compared to the cost of illegal immigration.

Building the wall will also solve the family separation issue. If families can’t enter illegally, then they won’t be separated while the adults await trial and sentencing. A wall would also funnel legitimate asylum seekers to proper ports of entry. True asylum seekers have no need to cross the border illegally.

Securing the border once and for all won’t just protect desperate migrants from harm and save Americans money – it will also protect Americans from harm. The massive influx of unaccompanied minors across the border during the Obama administration brought with it a massive increase in MS-13 gang violence. Mexico’s cartels are also taking advantage of our porous border and flooding our communities with deadly drugs.

Finally, there is also the terror threat. Border Patrol agents routinely apprehend Middle Eastern suspects trying to enter America illegally.

The closer President Trump’s wall comes to completion, the closer we get to end the humanitarian crisis caused by our porous southern border. The Democrats’ dream of open borders and their unrelenting opposition to securing our border hurts the people they claim to care about the most.

BORDER SECURITY

Border Arrests Between Ports Of Entry Dropped By 6,000 In June: Report

By Anna Giaritelli

[Washington Examiner](#), July 1, 2018

The number of migrants that Border Patrol agents caught illegally entering the U.S. from Mexico between official ports of entry dropped in June following months of

record-high levels since President Trump took office a year and a half ago, according to a report published Sunday evening.

A little more than 34,000 people were arrested at the border by agents during the month of June, down about 6,000 arrests from 40,000 in May, according to information a government official gave the Associated Press. This figure does not include the number of people who arrived at ports of entry.

A senior CBP official would not confirm the validity of the numbers.

"As a matter of policy, CBP releases the apprehension and inadmissible numbers between the 6th and 8th of the following month to ensure accuracy and consistency," U.S. Customs and Border Protection Assistant Commissioner for Public Affairs Andrew Meehan said in an email. "CBP does not comment on unofficial numbers."

The drop would come three months after the start of Trump's April-implemented zero tolerance immigration policy.

CBP Commissioner Kevin McAleenan told reporters in McAllen, Texas, last week that he expected the June numbers, which will include other numbers in addition to those apprehended by Border Patrol between ports, to be down from May.

"The June numbers are looking like they're going to be lower," McAleenan said.

He pointed to the agency and Border Patrol's increased focus on border enforcement as what prompted what he forecast would be a downturn in the number of apprehended adults, unaccompanied minors, and family units in the month of June.

However, last month, following the release of the May figures, Homeland Security Department press secretary Tyler Houlton said it would take "many months" before border officials would be able to get a hold of the spiking numbers.

"These numbers show that while the Trump administration is restoring the rule of law, it will take a sustained effort and continuous commitment of resources over many months to disrupt cartels, smugglers, and nefarious actors," Houlton said in a statement. "We are taking action and will be referring and then prosecuting 100 percent of illegal border crossers, we are building the first new border wall in a decade, and we have deployed the National Guard to the border."

McAleenan's predication that apprehension levels would dip in June was made in the same conversation he admitted the Trump administration has effectively suspended its two-month-old zero tolerance policy.

The policy was announced by Attorney General Jeff Sessions in April as a way to tell illegal entrants no person would be exempt from prosecution just because he or she was part of a family unit.

"I'm suggesting since the executive order we have prosecuted adults that came across with children, but we are not doing that widely because of the guidance in the executive order to maintain a family unit," McAleenan said.

Trump issued an executive order June 20 that directed DHS to keep family units together. Family separation happened when officials tried to prosecute adults, who then were taken away from their child.

DHS Projected To Make Fewer Border Arrests In June: Report

By Ali Breland

[The Hill](#), June 30, 2018

U.S. border agents are expected to make fewer arrests this month at the U.S.-Mexico border compared to last month.

Preliminary figures from a Department of Homeland Security (DHS) official reviewed by Reuters project a 16 percent drop in arrests from a month ago, with an estimated about 34,000 being arrested in total in June.

In May, 40,344 were arrested on the southwest border — the highest amount in President Trump's tenure.

The new figure follows Trump's "zero tolerance" immigration policy, which he began in May. The coordinated effort across immigration and border agencies to arrest and prosecute every undocumented immigrant crossing the border has led to a turbulent month for the White House.

The public and lawmakers on both sides of the aisle have spoken out against the most aggressive portions of the ramped-up policy, particularly DHS's practice of separating families crossing the border together. The agency places parents in detention centers and moves children into foster care or shelters while the adults await prosecution.

The administration had argued that the practice was a necessary part in securing the border and lowering the rate of illegal immigration, but the move sparked wide backlash when thousands of migrant children were separated from their parents.

Facing pressure to renege on the policy, Trump signed an executive order earlier this month that would allow migrant families to be detained together, though questions remain over how the administration will move to quickly reunite families.

Arrests At U.S.-Mexico Border Projected To Drop In June

By Yeganeh Torbati

[Reuters](#), June 29, 2018

Full-text stories from Reuters currently cannot be included in this document. You may, however, click the link above to access the story.

Arrests At U.S.-Mexico Border Projected To Drop In June

By Yeganeh Torbati

[Reuters](#), June 29, 2018

Full-text stories from Reuters currently cannot be included in this document. You may, however, click the link above to access the story.

APNewsBreak: Border Patrol Arrests Drop Sharply In June

By Elliot Spagat

[Associated Press](#), July 1, 2018

MCALLEN, Texas (AP) – Border Patrol arrests fell sharply in June to the lowest level since February, according to a U.S. official, ending a streak of four straight monthly increases.

The drop may reflect seasonal trends or it could signal that President Donald Trump's "zero-tolerance" policy to criminally prosecute every adult who enters the country illegally is having a deterrent effect.

The agency made 34,057 arrests on the border with Mexico during June, down 16 percent from 40,344 in May, according to the official, who spoke on condition of anonymity because the numbers are not yet intended for public release. The June tally is preliminary and subject to change.

Arrests were still more than double from 16,077 in June 2017, but the sharp decline from spring could undercut the Trump administration's narrative of a border in crisis.

Customs and Border Protection, which includes the Border Patrol, declined to comment on the numbers, saying it doesn't discuss them as a matter of policy until public release "to ensure consistency and accuracy."

The administration announced in early May that it was prosecuting every illegal entry, including adults who came with their children. The separation of more than 2,000 children from their parent sparked an international outcry and Trump reversed course on June 20, ordering that families should stay together.

Customs and Border Protection Commissioner Kevin McAleenan told agents to temporarily stop referring illegal entry arrests to the Justice Department for prosecution if they involve parents unless they had a

criminal history or the child's welfare was in question. His edict came "within hours" of Trump's directive to avoid splitting families.

McAleenan told reporters last week that border arrests were trending lower in June but said he wouldn't provide numbers until their public release in early July.

"I believe the focus on border enforcement has had an impact on the crossings," McAleenan said.

Rising temperatures could also be a major influence, discouraging people from walking in the scorching and potentially lethal heat in much of California, Arizona, New Mexico and Texas. Arrests fell from May to June in four of the previous five years, last year being the exception.

Still, the month-to-month percentage decline is notable. It fell in the low single digits in 2014 amid a major surge in illegal crossings and in 2015. Declines approached 20 percent in 2016 and 2013.

The numbers do not reflect activity at official crossings. The Border Patrol polices between ports of entry, not at them.

Copyright 2018 Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten, or redistributed.

Concern Over Using US Military To Help Border Enforcement

By Robert Burns

[Associated Press](#), June 29, 2018

WASHINGTON (AP) – The Trump administration's request for the Pentagon to house migrants detained at the U.S. southern border and even help prosecute them is prompting concern about strains to the military.

Some call it an inappropriate mission.

"We shouldn't be militarizing border enforcement," Rep. Ro Khanna, a California Democrat, said in an interview.

Defense Secretary Jim Mattis, who has made it his top priority to improve the military's fitness for combat, argues that the Pentagon is nonetheless obliged to provide help with border enforcement.

In recent days Mattis has accepted requests by the departments of Homeland Security and Health and Human Services to provide temporary housing on Air Force and Army bases for potentially tens of thousands of detained migrant families and unaccompanied children. This is in line with historical precedents for military assistance, Mattis argued.

"We have housed refugees, we have housed people thrown out of their homes by earthquakes and hurricanes; we do whatever is in the best interest of the country," he recently told reporters. But he also has

insisted that decisions about immigration policy and its security implications are not his to make. "I'm not going to chime in from the outside," he said.

The Pentagon says it received a Department of Homeland Security request to house up to 12,000 detained migrant family members, starting with shelters for 2,000 people to be available within 45 days. The initial shelters are likely to be at Fort Bliss in Texas, but subsequent tent cities could be at two other bases in border states.

The Pentagon has indicated Mattis will accept these requests, but no steps have been taken yet to move migrants onto the bases.

Mattis has emphasized that members of the military will not be directly involved in detaining or securing migrants. By law, the military is barred from performing domestic law enforcement functions such as arresting people crossing the border, but it has sometimes provided support for border security, including monitoring surveillance imagery and repairing border fences.

Nonetheless, Mattis has been the target of pointed objections from senators critical of the Pentagon taking on a bigger role, including lending 21 military lawyers to the Justice Department to help prosecute immigration cases at the border.

"Clearly, the military needs more, not fewer, lawyers available for its critical military justice practice," Sens. Joni Ernst, R-Iowa, Kirsten Gillibrand, D-NY, and Patrick Leahy, D-Vt., wrote in a letter to Mattis last week. They pointed out the Pentagon already had said that military lawyers are too busy to expand the services of special victims counsel.

"Instead, we have now learned the services will be diverting these valuable resources to support a non-military mission," the senators wrote, adding that they are "deeply troubled" by what they consider a misuse of military personnel.

The Pentagon has agreed to set up tents – which it euphemistically calls "semi-separate, soft-sided camp facilities" – at Fort Bliss, if needed, for detained migrant families starting this summer. It has also agreed to make housing available at Goodfellow Air Force Base in Texas for up to 20,000 unaccompanied minors detained for illegally crossing the southern border.

These shelter operations, which could last for months, are to be run by DHS or HHS or their contractors, not the Pentagon, but defense officials say it is possible that the Pentagon will end up erecting the shelters.

This is not unprecedented. The Pentagon temporarily housed several thousand unaccompanied detained minors in 2014 at military bases. This year's

problem has drawn wider attention and sharper criticism in part because of the administration's now-suspended practice of separating children from parents who are detained for illegally crossing the border.

"We certainly should not be using our nation's vital military bases for non-defense purposes," Rep. Raja Krishnamoorthi, an Illinois Democrat, said earlier this month in arguing that Congress should block funding for migrant detention facilities on military bases.

Even some Republicans who support Trump's crackdown on illegal immigration are unenthusiastic.

"I am not convinced at this point that housing them in our military installations is the best short-term answer, especially if it harms regular base operations, crowds our service members, and distracts from the mission of defense," Rep. Jodey Arrington, a Texas Republican, said in a statement. His district includes Dyess Air Force Base, which is among bases under consideration for sheltering unaccompanied detained minors.

More broadly, Trump has urged the Pentagon to help pay for the border wall that he says is critically important to stemming the tide of illegal immigration. "Our Military is rich again," he wrote on Twitter in late March, adding that the Pentagon should pay for the wall because it would keep "enemy combatants" out of the country.

Copyright 2018 Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten, or redistributed.

Trump: Melania Saw 'the Danger' During Her Mexican Border Visits

By Nikki Schwab

[New York Post](#), July 1, 2018

President Trump said First Lady Melania Trump witnessed a "very sad situation" during her two visits to the Mexican border but also "saw the danger."

"She came home and told me a couple of things. She said it's a very sad situation, very, very sad," Trump recounted to Fox News' Maria Bartiromo on "Sunday Morning Futures." "She was really impressed with border patrol, how professional they were. She came and said that, and she was really saddened by the plight of people."

The president described his wife as having a "very big heart."

"But she was so strong on how professional the border patrol, the agents, the law enforcement is along the border," he said in the interview that aired Sunday. "She couldn't believe it."

"And she saw the danger. She saw the – you look at it. It just looks like danger. In the meantime we have to have strong border protection," he added.

Trump pushed back on Democrats and the thousands of people who rallied across the country on Saturday to protest his immigration policy that has led to thousands of children being separated from their parents and to call for an end to Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

He relished how the Democrats' position would help him politically.

"You get rid of ICE you're going to have a country that you're going to be afraid to walk out of your house," Trump said. "I love that issue if they're going to actually do that."

The president answered in the negative when asked if images of children being separated from their parents at the border were going to hurt Republicans in the midterm elections.

"No," Trump said. "First of all I signed an executive order last week saying I don't want families broken up. Nobody else did that."

He also suggested the Democrats' leftward swing – namely with 28-year-old Democratic-Socialist Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez's win over Rep. Joe Crowley in last week's Democratic primary – would end up hurting the party.

"Between Maxine Waters and Nancy Pelosi and getting rid of ICE and having open borders ... all it's going to do is lead to massive, massive crime. That's going to be their platform, open borders, which equals crime," Trump said, naming two liberal and vocal members of the Democratic Party. "I think they'll never win another election."

"So I'm actually quite happy about it," the president said.

Vermont US Sen. Leahy Seeks To Limit Border Search Zones

[Associated Press](#), June 29, 2018

MONTPELIER, Vt. (AP) — Vermont's Democratic U.S. Sen. Patrick Leahy wants to reduce the size of the zone in which border agents can question people about their immigration status.

Currently, officers of the Department of Homeland Security have broad legal authority to stop vehicles and search private land, without warrants within 100 miles of the border.

The distance, which includes sea borders, means that most of New England, and two-thirds of the population of the United States, falls into the category.

The legislation that Leahy introduced Thursday along with Washington Democratic Sen. Patty Murray would, among other things, reduce the "border zone" to 25 miles.

They say the legislation is needed because Trump administration policies have been subjecting law-abiding citizens to needless and intrusive searches, including checkpoints in New Hampshire and Maine.

Copyright 2018 Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten, or redistributed.

Border Patrol Agent Explains Why Asylum Seekers Cross The US Illegally

By Daniel Brown

[Business Insider](#), June 30, 2018

The Department of Justice is drafting a plan that would bar asylum seekers who crossed the US border illegally from getting asylum, according to a new report from Vox.

The DOJ's plan would even make it more difficult for Central Americans fleeing gang violence to qualify for asylum, Vox reported.

Because of President Donald Trump's new zero-tolerance policy, asylum seekers who cross illegally are already referred for prosecution instead of being sent to the ports of entry, which can delay and complicate the asylum process.

But a US Border Patrol agent who operates in the McAllen sector along the Rio Grande River in Texas recently told Business Insider that smugglers sometimes force some asylum seekers to cross illegally.

A Border Patrol agent speaks with Central American immigrant families who crossed into the United States seeking asylum on April 14, 2016 in Roma, Texas.

Getty Images

"The main reason is because the smuggling organizations control the border," the agent, Rene Quintanilla, told Business Insider. "So anytime [smugglers] see somebody that's not from that area, they'll flag them ... they'll start charging to get through their areas."

"If these [immigrants and asylum seekers] go through these port of entries then the smuggler isn't getting paid," Quintanilla said.

The smugglers don't see the immigrants as individuals, Quintanilla said. They're "seen as a commodity and that's money [the smugglers are] losing if they're going to the port of entries," Quintanilla said.

But "every case varies," Quintanilla said.

Smugglers sometimes even go into other countries to “seek for these individuals who want to leave,” Quintanilla said.

“Some of these [immigrants and asylum seekers] have never even left their country, have never even left the area they’re from,” Quintanilla said. “So they don’t know the routes, they don’t know anything on how to get anywhere.”

AVIATION SECURITY

It Started With Your Shoes, Then Your Water. Now The TSA Wants Your Snacks.

By Martine Powers

[Washington Post](#), June 29, 2018

They came for your laptops. And for your liquids, and your shoes. Now, the Transportation Security Administration is coming for your snacks.

Passengers at airports across the country — including all three of the Washington region’s major airports — are reporting a rise in TSA agents instructing them to remove their snacks and other food items from their carry-ons and place them in those ubiquitous plastic bins for a separate screening.

It’s not part of the agency’s standard policy, according to TSA spokesman Mike England. It’s simply a recommendation issued by the agency last year to help speed the bag-check process. Screening supervisors at airports have the discretion to decide whether, and when, to demand that passengers proffer up their pretzel packs for a solo trip through the X-ray machine.

But the “recommendation” appears to be gaining steam and moving rapidly into the territory of de-facto protocol, according to travelers who have received snack-related notices from their airlines, and who have been informed by rank-and-file TSA screeners that the snack checks are now standard practice.

“He was just like, ‘Sorry. This is a new policy. This is what we’re doing now,’ ” Anny Gaul, 33, said of her recent interaction with a TSA agent at Baltimore-Washington International Marshall Airport.

Gaul, a frequent traveler, had never heard such instructions before while waiting in an airport security line. But here she was in April, standing near the front of a long TSA line, with a bag screener shouting that all passengers would need to remove their food items and place them in a separate bin.

She started rifling through her carry-on to find the candy bar and the plastic bag of trail mix that she knew were floating around inside. Other travelers, also visibly bewildered, started scrounging around in their bags for errant packs of Goldfish and squashed energy bars. The

line, Gaul said, was moving noticeably slower than normal.

“It definitely caused a delay — not huge, but at least by like five or 10 minutes,” the Georgetown University PhD student said. “Mostly it was just bizarre and absurd.”

According to England, the snack-removal recommendation is part of an effort to better detect explosives on planes, and to limit the number of bags that are flagged for special searches.

England said the concern is not that people may be hiding explosives or other illicit material inside of food. Rather, it’s that the food itself can look similar to the components of an explosive — therefore making it more likely that bags with snacks would be flagged for a time-consuming manual search. Officials thought it might be more efficient, in some cases, to have passengers remove the snacks from their bags ahead of time.

England said he could not provide specific information on how a pack of pretzels could resemble an explosive. He disputed the idea that the new attention on snacks might be an excessive screening measure.

“There’s a very good reason for everything we do. Nothing is arbitrary,” England said.

He said there are no immediate plans to standardize the practice at every airport across the country, but the procedure is employed at times when supervisors think it might speed things up.

“It’s not a requirement. It’s a recommendation,” England said. “But you might see them recommending a little louder during busy times of the day.”

It remains unclear whether the snack-removal protocol is effective in reducing wait times — whether the decrease in bags flagged for special screenings makes up for the disruption for passengers as they perform a last-second hunt for the food stuffed in their bags.

England acknowledged that there might be “isolated incidents” when asking passengers to remove food from their bags might slow things down, though he pointed out that, nationally, 96 percent of standard passengers have a wait that is 20 minutes or less.

Christina Saull, spokeswoman for the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority, said that, so far, the new procedure has not led to longer wait times at either Reagan National or Dulles International airports.

That hasn’t stopped the complaints on social media.

“Of all the TSA rules, the arbitrarily enforced ‘dig every snack out of your bags’ is the dumbest,” tweeted Anne Keller after she encountered the snack screening at National.

And passengers aren’t just noticing in Washington. Travelers have complained about the practice being

used at Dallas Love Field as well as at Chicago O'Hare International, Los Angeles International, Newark Liberty International and Hartsfield-Jackson Atlanta International airports. The recommendation is gaining traction at smaller airports, too — in Boise, Idaho; Greenville, S.C.; and Manchester, N.H.

"How bizarre," tweeted Cindy Armstrong at Redmond Municipal Airport in Oregon.

"Some terrorist is making bombs out of Frito-Lay," mused a passenger waiting at Orlando International Airport.

"It is a nationwide policy . . . making all parents stand in line longer with kids who have to pee," quipped a traveler who encountered the practice at Mineta San Jose International Airport.

"TSA asked me to take my snacks out of my bag and I feel personally victimized," tweeted Thea Neal of Kansas City, Mo.

When Neal, 29, a social-media manager for a greeting-card company, was asked to remove her snacks, she immediately panicked. Had she missed a memo about new security protocol? And, more importantly, was TSA going to confiscate her food?

"I had a whole bunch of crazy snacks in my bag that I was really excited to eat," she recalled.

Happily, her snacks were returned after getting X-rayed in their separate bin. Still, she remains uncomfortable with the idea that this may become standard practice for every trip through airport security. The procedure doesn't make her feel safer — "It seemed, honestly, completely pointless," she said — and there are sanitary considerations to boot.

"I was lucky that everything I brought was prepackaged. But if it was fruit or something . . ." she said while shuddering to think about her food items rolling around in a plastic bin. "Those things are pretty disgusting. People put their shoes and their money in there."

Lauren Rosenberg, a 20-year-old college student from Houston, questions whether the practice will help the security lines proceed any faster. When it happened to her last Monday at Austin-Bergstrom International Airport, the process of hunting down the granola and Luna bars stuffed in her bag ended up holding up the line.

And Rosenberg started asking questions. Why did they need to look at her snacks? Was this a permanent new policy? The TSA agent in her line didn't know. "I just need you to take out your snacks, your Doritos and your M&Ms," she recalled him saying.

Rosenberg said she worries that this is more than just another inconvenience foisted upon travelers. It's a slippery slope. Rosenberg, a college junior, is young

enough that she hardly remembers a time when liquids larger than 3.4 ounces weren't banned from planes.

"The next thing they're going to make us take out of our bags is medicine," she said. "And that would be a real invasion of privacy."

IMMIGRATION POLICY

"Are You Alone Now?"

[Washington Post](#), June 30, 2018

He had been afraid to go outside since his mother was detained in an immigration raid 14 days earlier, but now someone was pounding on the front door of their trailer. Alex Galvez, 12, waited until the knocking stopped and then cracked the door open to find a small flier left behind on the top step. He carried it into the kitchen and read it to his older sister. "Emergency giveaway outside the Post Office! Free food in your time of need!"

"I'm not going," Alex said, once he'd finished reading the flier. It had been the promise of free doughnuts that enticed his mother and dozens of her co-workers out of the planting fields and into the break room that day, where instead they had been met by 200 federal agents with plastic handcuffs and guns. Alex folded up the flier and tossed it onto the table.

Alex Galvez, 12, center, plays with his second cousins in his family's mobile home in Norwalk, Ohio. Alex, a U.S. citizen, was separated from his mother and is being taken care of by his sister after ICE raided a nursery where many of the trailer park's residents worked.

"I'm sorry, but I think you need to go," said his sister, Estefany, 18. "We could always use the food."

"No. I don't want to."

"We can't hide in here forever," she said, handing him an empty plastic bag. "I have to go to work. You're the only one who can do it."

Since the day of the raid, they had been staying in the trailer with a rotation of older relatives — two more children adjusting to a life without their parents as a result of U.S. immigration policies. Even as President Trump and his administration promise to reunite families separated by Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) at the U.S. border, a similar crisis continues unabated within the country's interior, where children are separated from their undocumented parents with little scrutiny and increasing frequency.

In the past few months, ICE has carried out the three biggest workplace immigration raids of the past decade, including one on June 5 at a nursery here in rural Ohio, where 114 gardeners, florists and other workers were detained and put into court proceedings

for deportation. Many of them had lived for several years in a Norwalk trailer park of 74 homes known as Little Mexico, where now aid workers estimate that more than 90 children are missing one parent and at least 20 are left with no parent at all.

One of them is Alex, an American citizen like most children in the trailer park, with a wardrobe of Cleveland Cavaliers T-shirts and frosted tips dyed orange at the barbershop inside Walmart. He'd spent all 12 of his years in Norwalk, population 17,000, and for much of that time he'd lived in the trailer parks of Little Mexico, in a beige double-wide with his sister and mother, Nora Galvez, who first came to the United States in 1999. The air outside their trailer smelled of smoke and rubber from the neighboring pallet factory. The favorite community soccer field was in fact a gravel lot. But Alex knew every one of the 74 families in the two trailer parks, and he and his friends could wander freely on their bikes from one trailer into the next. Many people in conservative Norwalk regarded Little Mexico as an ugly annex, a place to be left alone, but to Alex that meant it had always felt peaceful and undisturbed.

Now he walked out of the trailer with his empty shopping bag into a scene that looked to him like something out of "Fortnite," his favorite apocalyptic video game. There were gardens of dying flowers and trash cans overloaded with uncollected garbage. More than a dozen trailers had been abandoned in the hours after the raid, and many of them had windows left open or toys scattered in the yard. Five residents of Little Mexico had been deported, and 34 others remained in detention, including Alex's mother. Several more residents had packed up and fled Ohio that night, after a rumor spread that ICE was also planning to raid the trailer park. Those who remained were mostly out of a job or too afraid to go to work, and after two weeks of unpaid bills, some had also lost their electricity.

Residents of the Jefferson Trailer Park gather to receive donated food, clothing and diapers in Norwalk, Ohio. The park, known locally as Little Mexico, is populated almost entirely by immigrants from the Mexican state of Chiapas.

"A ghost town," Alex called it, as he made his way toward the one-room post office at the center of the park, but what bothered him more than the rows of darkened trailers was imagining what might be happening inside. He had heard about the 27-year-old who mysteriously stopped eating or speaking in the days after his sister was detained in the raid, eventually dying in the hospital a week later. He knew about the 23-year-old who had become suicidal after his girlfriend's family decided to flee for Mexico, hanging a noose outside of his trailer until a relative took him to a hospital.

On the exterior walls of the post office, Alex saw a few new brochures for suicide hotlines and free mental-health counseling. A few dozen people were gathered outside, mostly children, young mothers and several volunteers from local nonprofit organizations. One of them handed out crayons and bubbles to children. A woman distributed crates of eggs from the back of her truck. A nurse checked residents' blood pressure. Volunteers came up to Alex offering pizza, milk, vegetables and books, until he began to politely wave them away.

"We're fine," he said. "We don't really need much."

"Are you alone now?" one volunteer asked, and Alex shook his head.

"I'm with my sister," he said.

"I'm sorry," she said, reaching for his shoulder, tears welling in her eyes. "I can't believe this is happening to you. It's unthinkable."

"Thanks," he said. "It's okay. I've been through it before."

One of the things that had confused him during the past few weeks was the shock he sometimes saw reflected back at him in strangers' faces — the volunteers who toured the trailer park in utter disbelief, or the TV anchors who broke down in the middle of their live broadcasts from the U.S. border. They said separating a parent from a child was cruel and un-American. They said the United States was in the midst of a singular humanitarian crisis. They said these were the actions of a country they no longer recognized. But, to Alex, the act of family separation seemed quintessentially American. It was the cornerstone of his American experience.

His father had been deported when Alex was 3, yanked from work during a raid at Casa Fiesta, a local Mexican restaurant, and then flown back to Chiapas. An uncle had been deported two years later, and then an aunt had left for Mexico a few months after that, forcing their two children to stay for a little while in Alex's trailer. At age 8, he and his mother had been pulled over on their way home from Walmart by ICE agents, who detained them in a holding facility overnight before releasing them, since Nora was a longtime Ohio resident with no criminal record and therefore, according to her court paperwork, "not a priority for removal." Four other relatives had been deported or fled to Mexico in the years since then, a family reshaped again and again by separation. Alex's father remained in Chiapas, with a new wife and two half brothers Alex had never met. His half sisters had come and gone between Mexico and the United States. The only person Alex had never been separated from was his mother.

So that night, when his sister Estefany came home alone from work at Corso's Flower and Garden Center, Alex suspected what had happened, even as his sister began filling in the details: ICE agents had arrived at 7:15 a.m., wearing camouflage and tactical gear, swarming the greenhouses with the help of barking K9s and helicopters, rounding up several hundred employees and then separating them into two lines. Estefany, who was born in Ohio, had gone into one line for U.S. citizens, and her mother had gone into the line for undocumented workers. Agents had handcuffed her mother with plastic zip ties and led her toward a bus, and Estefany had run to join her, trying to convince ICE agents that she, too, was undocumented. But inside her wallet was a U.S. Social Security card, so agents led Estefany back into the other line for citizens as her mother boarded the bus. Nora shouted over her shoulder that there was \$140 cash in the house and that Estefany needed to remind Alex to wash out his knee. He had skinned it a few days earlier in a bike accident, a small surface wound. "Make sure he washes it twice a day," Nora called out, before the bus pulled away.

Children play soccer outside their mobile homes in the Norwalk trailer park, where they also wander freely on bikes.

A sign outside of a mobile home in Norwalk. Many of the trailer park residents are in detention because of a workplace raid.

Fiorella de la Cruz, whose husband has been detained by ICE, is pregnant and waits outside a free medical clinic at the Jefferson Trailer Park.

Estefany was old enough to act as Alex's legal guardian, and she had been trying her best to take care of him with the help of other relatives, even as she was learning how to take care of herself. She had originally applied to Corso's for a summer job, hoping to make a little money before starting her final year of high school, but now she was the family's primary earner, with no plans to return to school. She had written her first rental check and returned to work at the nursery wearing sunglasses big enough to hide her puffy eyes. Other relatives were helping with cooking, child care and errands, but Estefany considered herself responsible for Alex, even now, as the sky darkened outside their trailer on their 15th night alone.

"It's getting late," she told him. "We need to be better about going to bed."

"I know," he said,

"You should get ready," she said.

"In a little while," he told her.

They had been sharing a room for the past weeks, relying on each other's company to make it through the night, since both of them struggled to sleep. On the first

night after the raid, they had driven at 2 a.m. to the Customs and Border Protection station in Port Clinton, Ohio, to ask if their mother was inside, but Estefany said nobody would tell them. On the second night they had driven back, and this time they were told that Nora was inside but they couldn't see her. On the third night they had tried one more time, and when they were stopped at the door Estefany had lost her patience. "Who benefits from this?" she remembered asking. Was it American taxpayers, who were paying to finance the raid and resulting deportations? Or American workers, most of whom were so disinterested in low-paying farm work that Ohio had announced a crisis work shortage of 15,000 agricultural jobs? Or Corso's Nursery, a family-owned business now missing 40 percent of its employees?

She wanted to know, out of 114 minimum-wage workers detained at Corso's, how many were narcos, or rapists, or cartel members, or killers for MS-13? "These were just hard-working people, making \$9 an hour and going about their lives," she remembered saying.

Alex, meanwhile, had decided to write a letter to ICE. His mother was still in detention, waiting for her first court date on the possible path toward deportation, and he thought maybe he could still help her. "The only thing my Mom ever did was work," he had written. "She loved me so much. I can't live without my Mom. I don't have anybody but her. I have been crying every day. I can't sleep."

"Come on. Let's go to bed," Estefany said again. It was nearing midnight, but Alex turned on a Harry Potter movie.

"A little bit longer," he said, and Estefany sat down next to him.

Alex was still on the couch the next morning, wrapped under a blanket and watching soccer on TV when his phone rang. He looked down at the restricted number and waved to his sister. "It's her!" he said. Then he answered the phone and put it on speaker.

"Hi, Mom," he said.

She tried to call home from detention a few times each week, even though it meant paying nearly \$1 per minute. Alex and his sister had been allowed to visit her for the first time six days after the raid once she'd been moved to a detention facility in Tiffin, Ohio, where they spoke for 15 minutes through a shield of plexiglass. His mother had started to cry when she saw Alex, and the only way either of them could make it through a conversation was by talking about routine things, by pretending, which had become their habit ever since.

Yes, Alex always told her, he was getting along with his sister. Yes, he was sleeping well. Yes, everything was getting back to normal in the trailer park. Yes, his knee was healing just fine.

"See you soon," he said, and then he handed the phone to his sister.

A boy walks down a road in the Jefferson Trailer Park. Many families in the community were separated after a raid.

Only once they hung up and returned to the emptiness of the trailer did the uncertainty and fear begin to creep back in. On TV a few days earlier, Alex had heard Trump promise a "major increase" in immigration enforcement, and just a few days earlier 143 undocumented workers had been detained at a meat processing plant across the state in Salem. Alex had barely seen any of his friends since the raid, but their text messages told the story of families unraveling. One friend had fled with his father to Tennessee after his mother was detained in the raid. Another had moved in with relatives across the state. Two more were still living in the trailer park under the care of undocumented relatives, trying to avoid being seen.

Alex and his family had gotten advice from a volunteer lawyer, who told them it was still possible Nora could receive a bond and be returned home with an ankle monitoring bracelet, but so far she hadn't even been given a court date.

Nonprofit group sets up a hotline to help reunite immigrant families.

"She's going to get deported, right?" Alex asked his sister now.

"Maybe," she said.

"Will we stay here?"

"I don't know," she said.

"Will we move back to Mexico?"

"I don't know," she said again, "but it's going to be okay. We'll find a way to stay together."

He turned away and looked at the TV. Nothing about his 12 years in the United States suggested that was likely, and if he was going to be living without his parents, he didn't want to be treated like a child.

"You don't have to say that," he told her. "I know it's probably not true."

Donald Trump Squanders Credibility In Family Separation Drama

[USA Today](#), July 1, 2018

Sometime in the not-too-distant future, the United States could face simultaneous crises, and the word of the White House would be crucial.

Imagine, for example, that special counsel Robert Mueller produces a report for Congress containing evidence alleging that President Donald Trump obstructed justice or laundered money.

At the same time, a critical foreign policy situation arises — say that the administration claims it has irrefutable proof that Iran has relaunched its nuclear program, and Trump threatens a military response. Could the White House be believed? Or would the threat of war be a "wag the dog" distraction aimed at overwhelming talk of impeachment?

If the past few weeks are an indication, Americans couldn't be sure.

In the still smoldering fiasco created by Trump's decision to separate families crossing the border, double-talk from the White House abounded, and not just from the president himself.

Initially, White House Chief of Staff John Kelly, Attorney General Jeff Sessions and White House Director of Legislative Affairs Marc Short all described a policy aimed at deterring families from illegally entering the United States.

Homeland Security Secretary Kirstjen Nielsen and White House Counselor Kellyanne Conway, meanwhile, denied such policy existed.

Trump insisted that only Congress could stop the separations, and that he couldn't simply end the practice by executive order, only to do exactly that days later as public anger boiled over. A story by The Washington Post counted 14 times the Trump administration changing its story on the separations scandal.

Confusion continues to reign since Trump backed down. At one point, the Border Patrol said prosecutions of adults illegally crossing the border with children have been suspended, while the Justice Department said no such thing had happened.

Most Americans have come to recognize Trump's long and sordid abuse of facts. In recent weeks, his falsehoods have come even faster and with greater vigor. The Post tracked 3,251 false or misleading claims by Trump in his first 500 days in office.

The Toronto Star reported that Trump recently hit a record pace of 15 lies per day.

Over the weekend alone, reports suggested that North Korea is ramping up and looking for ways to conceal its nuclear program, giving the lie to Trump's assertion two weeks ago: "There is no longer a Nuclear Threat from North Korea." And Trump denied he had ever pushed House Republicans to pass a certain immigration bill — three days after urging them to do just that, in ALL CAPS, no less.

Sadly, this mendacity now seems to have infected Cabinet officials who counsel and carry out policy, as well as those who speak for Trump.

That's bad enough during a self-inflicted crisis such as the decision to remove small children from their parents and house them behind chain link fence. But

history suggests that the time will almost certainly come when the White House is plunged into a national or international crisis not of its own making, where lives are stake. When that happens and the public is desperate for straight talk, will there be anything left of Oval Office credibility?

It's hard to be confident that there will. And that, in itself, is a crisis.

Anthony Scaramucci: Democrats Have The Real Credibility Problem

By Anthony Scaramucci

[USA Today](#), July 1, 2018

In the wake of the child separation fiasco, President Donald Trump doesn't have a credibility problem — but his chief of staff and the Democrats do.

In March 2017, then-Department of Homeland Security Secretary John Kelly appeared on television promoting child separation as a powerful deterrent to illegal immigration. However, as details emerged about the border situation, his close confidant and successor at DHS, Kirstjen Nielsen, claimed there was no such policy. The messaging was as incompetent and dishonest as the policy was cruel and immoral, and people should be held accountable.

Because President Trump was largely correct on the issue, he doesn't face a credibility problem. There is no clean executive solution to border enforcement, and Congress is to blame for the ongoing illegal immigration crisis.

Within 48 hours of gaining a full understanding of the situation, the president issued an executive order bringing families back together. However, that order is unlikely to pass legal muster. The 1997 Flores settlement says the government cannot detain immigrant families for more than 20 days. Due to a backlog of tens of thousands of immigration cases, the remaining options are immediate deportation without due process, which is illegal, or "catch and release," which is ineffectual and unfair to law abiding American citizens.

Congress offers the best hope for a solution. President Trump is open to compromising on "zero tolerance" enforcement and providing a path to citizenship for "Dreamers" — immigrants brought into the country illegally as children — in exchange for border security funding, but Democrats see it more politically expedient to obstruct.

America must balance its role as a haven for the world's huddled masses with law, order and security. The president wants to find common ground, but the "resistance" is peddling false narratives to avoid making

a deal. The Democrats, not the president, have the real credibility problem.

Anthony Scaramucci, the founder and co-managing partner of SkyBridge Capital, was President Trump's White House director of communications.

Zero Tolerance Sowed Confusion From Start

By Colleen Long And Ricardo Alonso-Zaldivar

[Associated Press](#), July 1, 2018

The government's top health official could barely conceal his discomfort.

As Health and Human Services secretary, Alex Azar was responsible for caring for migrant children taken from their parents at the border. Now a Democratic senator was asking him at a hearing whether his agency had a role in designing the Trump administration's "zero tolerance" policy that caused these separations.

The answer was no.

"We deal with the children once they're given to us," responded Azar. "So we don't — we are not the experts on immigration."

Separating families while sidelining the agency responsible for caring for the children was only one example of a communication breakdown in the federal government that left immigrant children in limbo, parents in the dark about their whereabouts and enraged Americans across the country.

Today, the Trump administration is still dealing with the fallout: It's still not clear how officials will implement the policy or comply with a court order requiring that families be reunited within 30 days.

Instead, the administration is hoping Congress will fix the mess, despite its recent failure to pass immigration legislation.

"We are happy to change the policy when Congress gives us the tools to do it. That's what we're asking for," Marc Short, White House director of legislative affairs, said on MSNBC.

The idea of separating families goes back to the first two months of the Trump presidency. John Kelly, then the Homeland Security secretary, said it could be used as a deterrent. But the notion was quickly dropped, even as President Donald Trump pushed a hard line on immigration, a crucial issue for his political base.

But behind the scenes, senior policy adviser Stephen Miller and others hadn't given up on the concept. It suddenly reappeared this spring after a persistent spike in illegal crossings. It took the form of the zero-tolerance policy announced by Attorney General Jeff Sessions that requires criminally prosecuting anyone coming to the U.S. illegally.

Sessions and others argued families would have to be separated because children can't go to jail with their parents.

How or whether families would be reunited wasn't much of a concern to the policymakers, according to administration officials and others with knowledge of the discussions who spoke to The Associated Press on condition of anonymity. That lack of planning was evident in an interview Kelly, now White House chief of staff, did with NPR in May.

"The children will be taken care of — put into foster care or whatever — but the big point is they (the parents) elected to come illegally to the United States," he said.

The policy sowed confusion and anger not only in the border region, but in Washington. There was a lack of coordination among some of the government agencies involved in the process, the officials said. And there were multiple agencies involved: Customs and Border Protection, part of Homeland Security, detains immigrants. Health and Human Services is responsible for caring for children. Adults are referred to the Justice Department for prosecution. After those cases are resolved — generally a quick process — the adult immigrants are detained by Immigration and Customs Enforcement, another DHS agency.

Children were being sent hundreds of miles away from their parents and parents were unable to access hotlines to help them find their children. Some were deported without their kids. There was no system set up beforehand to link families and no plan on how to bring them back together, the officials said. More than 2,000 children were being separated from about 2,000 parents.

Religious and humanitarian leaders decried the policy. Doctors warned of serious trauma from separation. A pediatrician spoke of seeing a toddler weeping uncontrollably in a shelter and staff prevented from comforting her. Audio leaked of Border Patrol officers joking amid sobbing children.

As the crisis worsened, Trump tried to blame Democrats. Sessions quoted the Bible in his defense of the policy. Homeland Security Secretary Kirstjen Nielsen took questions during a tense White House press briefing and said there wasn't a policy to separate children. She was later heckled at a Mexican restaurant where she was eating dinner.

As criticism became more intense, Trump sought to calm the situation, the officials said. He had initially wanted to sign a full immigration bill as part of an executive order, but was told by attorneys that it wasn't possible, they said.

So, instead, Trump said he wanted an order written, and written quickly, they said. By midday on June 20, about six weeks after the policy started, Trump

had signed papers that stopped separation — but also still required 100 percent criminal prosecution for improper entry.

"We're going to have strong, very strong borders, but we're going to keep the families together," Trump said.

Now, the administration is arguing over how to implement the hastily formed order. They're struggling with how to reunite the families — pushed by a court order this past Tuesday requiring they do so within 30 days, and within 14 days for children younger than 5.

While administration officials insist they know where all the children are, there has been no clear plan on how families will be reunited. Parents are still detained. Some 500 children were already returned to their parents, but those kids never made it out of Border Protection custody.

Some White House aides were determined to reunite families with their children as soon as possible, recognizing it was the only way to put the episode behind them. But another group, including Miller and many at the Justice Department, were advocating a more combative approach, prioritizing removals and prosecutions. Any shift toward the humanitarian concerns, some in that camp have argued, would be a sign of weakness that would reflect poorly on the president, the officials said.

Trump continues to advocate immediate removal, without an appearance before a judge or other due process, for those apprehended entering the country illegally.

Vice President Mike Pence and Nielsen met with Central American leaders on Thursday to discuss the number of migrants trying to cross into the U.S.

In a speech in Guatemala, he said the U.S. was working to reunite families "from your nations who've been caught trying to illegally enter the United States — because we believe that we can — as the old book says — "do justice and love kindness."

But Pence also cautioned: "If you want to come to the United States, come legally, or don't come at all."

Copyright 2018 Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten, or redistributed.

The Latest: ACLU Says Government Wrong To Detain Families

[Associated Press](#), June 30, 2018

WASHINGTON (AP) — The Latest on immigrant parents and children separated at the U.S. border (all times local):

11:50 p.m.

The ACLU is disputing a Trump administration claim that it has to detain families indefinitely because of a court ruling barring it from separating them.

Lee Gelernt, deputy director of the ACLU Immigrants' Rights Project, said requirements in a case settlement known as the Flores agreement don't conflict with the order issued in San Diego on Tuesday that required the government to reunify immigrant families separated at the border.

The Department of Justice said in a court filing Friday in Los Angeles in the decades-old Flores case that the ruling requires it to keep families detained in order to keep them together.

Gelernt said the government has a constitutional obligation to release parents who don't pose a flight risk or danger, and that parents can choose to release their children if they don't want them to be in a family detention center.

The administration's zero tolerance policy has resulted in the separation of thousands of kids from their parents at the border.

9:25 p.m.

The Trump administration says a ruling this week by a federal judge in San Diego requiring the government to reunify families separated at the border means authorities can legally keep families detained, even those seeking asylum.

The Department of Justice said in a court filing Friday that the government is allowed to detain families now that the California judge has barred their separation.

The filing cites exemptions in a settlement known as the Flores agreement that allow authorities to keep families in custody.

The Flores agreement requires the government to release children "without unnecessary delay," which the government has generally interpreted to mean about 20 days.

The government is still pushing to amend the agreement, despite its new interpretation.

The judge in San Diego on Tuesday set a 30-day deadline for reuniting parents and children, and quicker for very young kids.

6:45 p.m.

The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services is reviewing its entire caseload of about 12,000 migrant children in federal care to determine who might be covered by a judge's ruling requiring that kids separated from their parents be reunited.

As a result, the number of children separated from their parents could be larger than the roughly 2,000 that

Health and Human Services was reporting earlier this week.

The official spoke to The Associated Press on condition of anonymity to discuss an evolving situation that has created frustration among advocates for the migrant families.

The judge on Tuesday set a 30-day deadline for reuniting parents and children, and quicker for very young kids. Health and Human Services says it is moving expeditiously to meet that goal, while ensuring that the children in its care will be safe once they are released.

The official said the audit will not slow down the work of reuniting families. "Nothing is being stopped in the process," the official said.

The official said Health and Human Services determined the audit was needed because the judge's order covers all separated families, not just children and parents who were split apart from May 5 to June 20, when the Trump administration's zero-tolerance policy led to family separations.

That's why the number of children separated from their parents could ultimately turn out to be larger than previously reported.

The official said the process for reuniting families basically follows the same steps that Health and Human Services has used for years to place children who arrive at the US borders by themselves, with no adult. The two main steps involve a background check of the adult who will be caring for the child and verifying the family relationship of the adult and the child.

--Ricardo Alonzo-Zaldivar, Associated Press

—

This item has been corrected to say the judge made the ruling on Tuesday, not June 22.

6:15 p.m.

New York City Mayor Bill de Blasio says he agrees with protesters and fellow Democratic politicians who are calling for the abolition of the federal government's chief immigration enforcement agency.

De Blasio said on WNYC radio Friday that Immigration and Customs Enforcement "has become a punitive, negative tool for division" and should be replaced with something else.

Democratic politicians including New York Sen. Kirsten Gillibrand and congressional candidate Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez have said that ICE should be abolished.

About 100 protesters chanted "Abolish ICE!" as they marched through lower Manhattan on Friday.

Protester Suzanne Rust said she was shocked that migrant families have been separated trying to cross the border from Mexico.

Rust said she was “just fed up” and wanted to protest “what’s happening in this country.”

4:20 p.m.

Democrats considering a presidential run in 2020 are joining the calls to overhaul U.S. immigration enforcement — and some of them are even echoing activists’ calls to “abolish ICE.”

That’s the Immigration and Customs Enforcement agency that was created after the 9/11 attacks.

New York Sen. Kirsten Gillibrand says it should be scrapped. California Sen. Kamala Harris says “maybe” the government should look at a new model.

Other leading Democrats say the focus should be on President Donald Trump’s policies and not the government’s organizational chart.

The issue could be complicated for Democrats. The party must deal with its liberal and ethnically diverse base, which will shape the presidential nominating fight.

4:05 p.m.

Tina Fey is joining some of Broadway’s biggest stars for a concert being livestreamed Saturday to benefit migrants on the Mexican border.

The lineup also will feature Audra McDonald, Idina Menzel, Chita Rivera, Brian Stokes Mitchell, Norm Lewis, Matt Bomer, Andrew Rannells and Keala Settle.

The concert is set for 5 p.m. Eastern at The Cooper Union in downtown New York City. It will be broadcast via Facebook Live and at [ConcertsforAmerica.com](https://www.concertsforamerica.com).

Highlights will include Rivera singing “America” from “West Side Story” and the reuniting of McDonald and Mitchell for “Wheels of a Dream” from the musical “Ragtime.” Settle is flying into New York specifically to perform “This Is Me” from the film “The Greatest Showman.”

3:45 p.m.

The Organization of American States is urging the United States to follow through on President Donald Trump’s decision to stop the separation of migrant families at the southern border.

The 34-nation regional bloc is also calling for the U.S. to reunite migrant children with their parents as soon as possible.

The OAS adopted that resolution without debate or vote — or objection from the U.S. delegation.

It is much less critical toward the Trump administration than the original draft resolution proposed by Mexico, El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras.

The resolution was watered down after the leaders of Guatemala, El Salvador and Honduras met Vice President Mike Pence in Guatemala on Thursday.

It still urges Washington not to prosecute asylum seekers and calls for human rights investigators to visit the border.

3:15 p.m.

Homeland Security’s watchdog group has found that some inspections for immigration detention facilities are inadequate.

The report Friday by the Inspector General for the U.S. Department of Homeland Security found inspections that were contracted out by other agencies were overly broad and not consistently thorough.

The report says the inspections do not fully examine the actual conditions at the 211 facilities. Some are operated by the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, some are contracted out, and some are local jails. The average total daily population was 35,435.

The report comes as some lawmakers and activists are calling for an end to ICE.

ICE said it will re-evaluate the inspection scope and methodology and has already taken steps to bolster the oversight of contracted inspections.

The American Civil Liberties Union said the report shows the inspections are a charade.

2 p.m.

Immigrant advocates have filed a lawsuit alleging that federal officials are unfairly refusing to release unaccompanied immigrant children to relatives who are offering to care for them.

The suit filed Friday on behalf of five children also alleges that the Department of Health and Human Services places immigrant children in secure facilities without a say and administers psychotropic drugs to children without parental authorization.

The suit seeks class-action status and was filed in federal court in Los Angeles by groups including the National Center for Youth Law.

Some of the allegations are also being reviewed in another longstanding case that relates to immigrant children’s detention conditions.

The Department of Health and Human Services did not immediately respond to email messages seeking comment.

12:50 p.m.

The Trump administration's request for the Pentagon to house migrants detained at the U.S. southern border and even help prosecute them is prompting concern about strains to the military.

In Congress, some lawmakers are criticizing the move.

Defense Secretary Jim Mattis argues that the Defense Department is obliged to provide help.

But several senators are objecting to Mattis lending 21 military lawyers to the Justice Department.

The Pentagon has received a Department of Homeland Security request to house up to 12,000 detained migrant family members, starting with shelters for 2,000 people to be available within 45 days.

1 a.m.

Immigrants who have spent years fighting to change the country's immigration system are getting newfound support from liberal activists, moms and first-time protesters who are against the separation children from their parents at the U.S.-Mexico border.

Groups that pulled off massive women's marches the past two years and other left-leaning rallies are throwing their weight behind migrant families Saturday.

More than 600 marches could draw hundreds of thousands of people nationwide, from immigrant-friendly cities like Los Angeles and New York City to conservative Appalachia and Wyoming.

Though many are seasoned anti-Trump demonstrators, others are new to immigration activism, including parents who say they feel compelled to show up after heart-wrenching accounts of children forcibly taken from their families as they crossed the border illegally.

See AP's complete coverage of the debate over the Trump administration's policy of family separation at the border: <https://apnews.com/tag/Immigration>

Copyright 2018 Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten, or redistributed.

U.S. Won't Say How It Will Reunite Split-Up Immigrant Families

By Justin Sink

[Bloomberg News](#), June 29, 2018

The Trump administration has offered little indication of how it will reunite thousands of children separated from their families under the president's immigration policies, heightening concern that the government could fail to comply with a federal judge's order to expedite the process.

Administration officials have been unwilling to say whether they collected information necessary to reunite parents and children before separating them. They also won't say whether more children have been taken from their families since President Donald Trump signed an order June 20 that he said would stop the practice.

In a conference call Tuesday, officials even declined to provide concrete numbers on how many children still needed to be returned to family members, saying the situation was fluid. A spokesman for the Administration for Children and Families, the division of the Department of Health and Human Services responsible for the children, said that the agency would only report the total number of immigrant children it's detaining, which includes a larger number who came across the border alone.

"While we understand the interest in detailed breakdowns of this information, our mission has been and remains to provide every minor transferred to HHS, regardless of the circumstances, with quality and age-appropriate care and a speedy and safe release to a sponsor," Kenneth Wolfe, the ACF spokesman said in an email. "Currently, there are 11,869 minors in our care."

The figure is "constantly changing," he said. "Every day, minors are referred to our care and released from our care to parents, close relatives or suitable sponsors."

Public outrage over the separations led Trump to retreat last week from the "zero tolerance" policy toward unlawful border crossings Attorney General Jeff Sessions announced in April. Under the approach, parents and other caregivers apprehended after crossing the border were arrested and jailed, and the government placed their children with HHS. The administration is now exploring the construction of camps on military bases and new detention centers to house undocumented migrant families together.

U.S. District Court Judge Dana Sabraw on Tuesday ordered the Trump administration to return immigrant children younger than five to their parents within two weeks. Children five and older must be reunited within 30 days. He also ordered the government to provide for communications between detained caregivers and their children and not to deport adults without their kids.

"The unfortunate reality is that under the present system, migrant children are not accounted for with the same efficiency and accuracy as property" catalogued by the government, Sabraw said in his order.

A White House spokeswoman on Thursday said Sabraw's order endangers national security.

"The injunction must be removed immediately or we can't keep the country safe," Deputy Press Secretary Lindsay Walters told reporters aboard Air Force One.

Wolfe said that “HHS continues to evaluate the impact of the District Court ruling.” The government has not appealed Sabraw’s order.

The process may be further complicated because the U.S. has already deported an unknown number of parents split from their children at the border. HHS has also said it must run background checks on parents before returning their children. Advocacy groups say it is nearly impossible to verify the government’s claim that it already returned more than 500 migrant children who were still in the custody of Customs and Border Patrol when their parents completed judicial proceedings.

That’s stoked concern that a lack of planning could leave the government unable to bring some families back together. It’s “a chaotic circumstance of the government’s own making,” Sabraw wrote.

Government officials say they’re working as expeditiously as possible to reunite families.

HHS Secretary Alex Azar told lawmakers Tuesday that his department was applying new resources to the problem, and said that by using a “portal” maintained by the Office of Refugee Resettlement he was able to quickly locate immigrant children. He said allegations that children were missing were “false.”

“There is no reason why any parent would not know where their child is located,” Azar told the Senate Finance Committee, adding that he could “within seconds find any child.”

The Department of Homeland Security said in a statement over the weekend that it knows the location of all children in its custody, and that Immigration and Customs Enforcement has implemented an identification mechanism to ensure accurate tracking of family members.

But outside groups providing aide to immigrants say the administration is downplaying a brewing crisis.

The ICE identification system is “really vague” and it’s “not clear how parents, attorneys – anyone would utilize it” to track down specific children, according to Natalia Cornelio, director of the Texas Civil Rights Project’s criminal justice reform program. Aide groups have been given no information on how the system would be accessed, how it will work, when it will be online, and if it will include retroactive data, she said in a conference call Tuesday with reporters.

“This is a mechanism that should have existed before any parents were separated from their children,” Cornelio said.

Separately, the American Civil Liberties Union has filed a lawsuit that would require the administration to prove it knows where children and parents are, make public their plan to reunite them, and give parents a way to contact their children within a week of separation. The

administration has said its aim is for migrant children in custody to phone or Skype their parents at least twice a week.

Other factors are complicating the reunification effort.

The administration says that many of the children cannot be reunited until Congress passes new legislation that allows the administration to bypass a 1997 court settlement known as the Flores agreement. Federal courts have interpreted that policy to restrict detention of families to 20 days, meaning the federal government may wait until families complete immigration proceedings or receive asylum before reunifying them. White House officials have said they want Congress to address this issue in immigration legislation, but two bills have failed in the House in the last week.

“I cannot reunite them while the parents are in custody because the court order doesn’t allow kids to be with their parents for more than 20 days,” Azar said.

Azar said another complication is that his department must complete extensive vetting of parents to ensure they are not simply human traffickers pretending to be the parents of the separated children. Because unauthorized immigrants might not be carrying accurate paperwork, that process can be complicated.

The administration also says some adults voluntarily opted to return home after being separated from the children that accompanied them, further complicating reunification. But civil rights groups have petitioned the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, part of the Organization of American States, in hopes it can ensure parents are not removed from the country without being allowed to decide the fate of their children.

The separation “wreaks havoc in the immigration system,” Denise Gilman, director of The University of Texas School of Law’s immigration clinic and a co-signer to the petition, said in a statement.

“Children are forced into separate proceedings apart from their parents and asked to speak for themselves in court while parents must fight for asylum from within remote immigration detention centers,” she said. “History will judge this moment harshly.”

— With assistance by Ben Winck, and Jennifer Epstein

House Republicans Probe HHS Office In Charge Of Migrant Children

By Jessie Hellmann

[The Hill](#), June 29, 2018

Republicans on the House Energy & Commerce Committee are probing the Department of Health and

Human Services on its treatment of migrant children in its care.

"We support strong enforcement of our nation's borders. We also support keeping families together, and believe that children should not be separated from their parents," the members wrote in a letter to HHS Secretary Alex Azar.

"We also seek to ensure that children who are within the custody of ORR — whether because they crossed the border as an unaccompanied minor or because they crossed the border with a family member and were subsequently separated — are properly cared for while within the custody of [the Office of Refugee Resettlement.]"

The members asked for answers to a series of questions about children in ORR custody, including: how many are in ORR custody as a result of being separated from their parents or families; does ORR have the resources to properly care for the high number of children being transferred to their custody; what steps is ORR taking to track and address issues of abuse within HHS funded facilities and what medications is ORR authorized to administer.

The committee also investigated ORR in 2014 after a series of reports detailed allegations of abuse of minors in custody.

"Given HHS' historical difficulties in properly caring for [the children], the committee believes that additional scrutiny of ORR is warranted at this time," the members wrote.

The members also asked for all copies of contracts or grant agreements since 2014 between HHS and private companies that house the children, as well as any reports that relate to allegations of abuse of children in the custody of ORR from 2017 to the present.

The letter comes after HHS' watchdog announced it would probe the conditions at child detention centers.

The department said it is caring for 2,047 children who were separated from their parents because of the administration's "zero tolerance" immigration policy. A federal judge has ordered the Trump administration to begin reuniting them with their parents.

Dem Senator Blasts Administration For 'Cruelty And Incompetence' After Immigration Briefing

By Jordain Carney

[The Hill](#), June 29, 2018

Sen. Dick Durbin (D-Ill.) knocked the Trump administration's effort to reunite migrant families separated at the U.S.-Mexico border following a closed-door briefing with senators this week.

"It was clear from my meeting yesterday that the Administration is working harder to stop the court-ordered reunification of these families than returning the kids. In the well-worn words of President Trump: sad," Durbin said in a tweet on Friday.

Durbin's remarks came amid a string of tweets in which he called the Trump administration's "lack of answers" about migrant families' whereabouts and well-being "shocking."

He added that Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) has only been able to match a small fraction of immigrant parents with children in federal custody, calling those efforts an example of "cruelty and incompetence at work by the Trump administration."

Durbin's comments come after the administration was scheduled to brief Sens. Dianne Feinstein (D-Calif.), Ted Cruz (R-Texas) and Thom Tillis (R-N.C.) on Thursday before senators left town for a weeklong recess.

Spokespeople for Cruz and Tillis confirmed that the briefing took place. Feinstein's office didn't immediately respond to a request for comment.

Senators requested the briefing amid ongoing efforts to reach a deal on narrow legislation that would address migrant families detained for crossing into the U.S. illegally via the southern border.

Trump signed an executive order earlier this month to end his administration's "zero tolerance" policy that resulted in the separation of thousands of immigrant families detained along the border.

But the executive order has resulted in confusion on Capitol Hill, with different agencies offering contradictory statements on how that order is being carried out.

The closed-door briefing followed the House's rejection last week of two broader immigration bills that also would have addressed family separations.

And deep political divides in the Senate are complicating the chances of getting a deal on immigration — already considered a political lightning rod — months before the midterm elections.

Conservatives are warning Republicans against agreeing to "amnesty," arguing it would spark backlash from the base. GOP senators, meanwhile, have lined up behind legislation that would allow immigrant families to be detained together.

Democrats, too, are facing pressure from the left among those who are skeptical that the senators could support a deal involving Cruz, a conservative firebrand facing a tougher-than-expected reelection fight against Rep. Beto O'Rourke (D).

Credo Action, a progressive outside group, launched a petition this week arguing Feinstein and Durbin shouldn't compromise with Cruz.

"It is appalling that Sens. Feinstein and Durbin want to negotiate with Cruz," the petition says. "Tell Sens. Feinstein, Durbin and all congressional Democrats: No compromises with Republican extremism on immigration."

After 40 Days Apart And A Missed Flight, A Migrant Family Reunites

By Brent McDonald

[New York Times](#), June 29, 2018

BOSTON — When Ludin was released on bond from a federal detention center this week, an immigrant rights organizer brought the 43-year-old Guatemalan mother to the Austin airport for a flight to Providence, R.I. so she could reunite with the two children she had not seen in more than a month.

Forty days earlier, federal immigration officials in McAllen, Tex. had taken Ludin's 9-year-old daughter, Keyri, from her arms after the family had crossed illegally while seeking asylum. Ludin said a criminal gang had threatened to kill her teenage son, Elmer.

"I thought I'd never see them again," Ludin said the day after she was released. "How would I come to give them away?"

Ludin's son and daughter were among the more than 2,000 children detained and separated from their parents by United States border officials since early May, under the Trump administration's "zero tolerance" immigration policy. Unlike many of the migrant families, Ludin, who asked that her last name not be published because of fears for her and her family's safety, was not criminally prosecuted.

Her asylum case is pending, as are the cases for her daughter and 17-year-old son. Her husband, also named Elmer, came to the United States two years ago after his brother was killed and his life was threatened. His asylum case also is pending.

The federal government has reunified hundreds of families in recent weeks, but many still remain separated. Ludin recalled conversations she had with other women in detention.

"Many women were saying, 'You lucky one, you're going to see your kids, you're going to hug them. We still can't.' There are poor people still suffering, not knowing where their kids are."

This video explores what Ludin, Keyri and Elmer Jr. endured in their time apart.

For three days in South Texas, Ludin and her children were detained in separate warehouse cells. In

addition to missing each other, each complained of frigid conditions and harsh treatment by government agents.

After three days in detention, the children were transferred to a shelter in Michigan operated by Bethany Christian Services. Keyri was placed in the temporary care of a foster family. On June 20, she and her brother were released to the custody of their father, who traveled from Westborough, Mass.

On Wednesday, as Ludin prepared to fly to Providence, the anticipation for the reunion was palpable. Elmer Jr. kept checking his watch. Keyri kept asking her papa when mama was coming. Then, four hours before her scheduled arrival in Providence, the children and their father received a call from Ludin: She had missed her flight through a miscommunication with Frontier Airlines and would have to rebook on a flight to Boston for later in the night.

The long-awaited reunion finally happened at 1:30 a.m. at Boston's Logan Airport. The baggage carousels were mostly quiet. Security guards appeared to have gone home. Keyri, Elmer and their father, holding a dozen roses, fidgeted.

Finally, Ludin's plane landed. When she appeared down a long hallway, the family burst into an all-out run.

The next day, Ludin and her children began pursuing separate asylum claims. While that process plays out, they will be allowed to stay together.

NILO TABRIZY and AINARA TIEFENTHÄLER in Austin, Tex.

Salvadoran Deportee Finally Reunited With His Separated Daughter

By Anna-Catherine Brigida

[Washington Post](#), June 29, 2018

Arnovis Guidos Portillo, a Salvadoran farmer, rubbed his hands with excitement as he waited outside the international airport for his 6-year-old daughter to arrive. It had been a month since they had been separated as part of the Trump administration's "zero tolerance" policy.

In the ensuing weeks, he had been deported to El Salvador. His daughter Meybelin had been sent to a migrant shelter in the United States, but he had no idea where she was. Their only contact was through occasional phone calls from the little girl.

But now, she was arriving home.

"This is emotional and powerful," he said, swaying from side to side Thursday night as he waited for the plane to land. "I don't have words to describe how I feel at this moment."

Trump signed an executive order last week ending the forced separations after an outcry across the United

States and around the world. Since early May, more than 2,500 children were taken from parents who had crossed the border illegally and were being criminally charged, instead of facing immigration proceedings as in the past.

At least three of those parents were deported back to El Salvador without their children, according to Salvadoran officials.

On Tuesday, a U.S. judge ordered that children under 5 who had been separated from their parents be reunited with them within 14 days, and all other children within 30 days. She also ordered a halt to deportations of parents awaiting reunification with their children.

Guidos and his daughter are the first known case of a family reunification on Salvadoran soil after a forced separation. A group of 17 family members traveled for more than three hours from their home town to greet Meybelin with balloons and signs reading "Welcome home, Meybelin. We're happy for your return."

Guidos had decided to make the journey to the United States in May after having problems with a local gang member over a heated soccer match. El Salvador is one of the world's deadliest countries outside a war zone, with almost 4,000 homicides last year in a nation roughly the size of Massachusetts. Guidos crossed the Rio Grande with his daughter, and then they turned themselves in to the Border Patrol and asked for asylum.

In the four times he spoke to his daughter since being deported, Guidos told Meybelin that she couldn't travel yet because the plane that would take her was broken. On Wednesday, he finally told her: "Mi amor, don't worry, they fixed the plane. The plane is repaired and ready to take you. Soon, we'll be together again."

At 8 p.m. Thursday, Meybelin's plane landed. Reporters were prevented from entering the terminal's arrivals area to witness the encounter, and Guidos said government officials warned him against showing the girl's face to the media.

He left the airport through a side door and took his daughter directly to a car. Her mother, who is separated from Guidos, was also present.

The girl "hugged me and she smiled. I thought she was going to cry, but she didn't. She was really happy," the father told reporters after the reunion. The caravan of family members left late Thursday for the remote town of Corral de Mulas, where they live.

While Guidos was thrilled to be with his daughter, he said she is "traumatized" by the separation. He said that after they arrive back home, he planned on "sitting down for a while with Meybelin" to "chat and ask her many questions." He said he is looking forward to resuming their normal activities, such as "going out to walk, taking her to school and going to the beach."

Guidos still fears for his safety, he said, but the father and daughter will stay put for the time being.

"There is always fear and it's big, but I've always said that what has to happen will happen, but always hand in hand with Meybelin," Guidos said.

12-year-old Immigrant Prescribed Antidepressants In Shelter Due To Distress Over Family Separation, Lawsuit Alleges

By Aaron C. Davis

[Washington Post](#), June 29, 2018

After U.S. authorities detained a 12-year-old boy crossing the U.S.-Mexico border by himself in February, government contractors wrote in his file that he went from being calm and cooperative to showing signs of depression brought on by "being kept from his family," which had entered the country before him, according to a new court case.

The boy's condition deteriorated further in the care of shelters funded by the U.S. Office of Refugee Resettlement, which now holds over 2,000 children separated more forcefully from their parents under an abandoned policy of the Trump administration, the lawsuit alleges. He has been transferred to a psychiatric facility in Texas and placed on a regimen of antidepressants, it says, and the U.S. government is refusing to release him to an adult sister in Los Angeles, saying her home may not be suitable and that the boy is not yet "psychologically sound" for release.

The complaint, filed Friday in federal court in California, illustrates the difficulties the Trump administration faces in complying with a federal judge's order to reunify all 2,000 children and their parents within a month. Many of those children — perhaps "hundreds," the lawsuit estimates — are already caught up in a bureaucratic tangle of medical determinations and assessments of family members to which they could potentially be released. In several cases documented in the suit, those issues have taken a year or more to be resolved.

The lawsuit alleges that delays in releasing minors amount to violations of their constitutional rights.

"Basic due-process rights for these children are really being trampled on right now by the Trump administration," said Leecia Welch, an attorney for the National Center for Youth Law, one of the groups that brought the case. "Child after child has told us the same story of being awoken at 4 a.m., and flown across the country to be detained without being told why, let alone a judicial determination as to why. What ORR is doing is saying it can incarcerate children and throw away the key for as long as it likes."

The Department of Health and Human Services declined to comment.

But in court filings in a separate case, the federal government has asserted that it has the right and responsibility to have doctors at shelters administer drugs to minors when needed. It has relied largely on authority courts have said it has in emergency situations to do so. In May, the Justice Department also pushed back on allegations that it was moving too slowly in discharging children to sponsors, saying it has a responsibility to adequately review and vet the conditions immigrants will live in.

Welch said the Justice Department all but invited advocates for immigrant children to file the suit during a recent court exchange over whether the government has the authority to prescribe psychotropic medications and whether it is violating previous legal agreements to release children as quickly as possible.

"To the extent Plaintiffs wish to challenge the sufficiency of constitutionality of the process ... they should do so in separate litigation," the Justice Department wrote in a court filing in May.

The group bringing the suit includes the same core group of attorneys and advocacy organizations that filed a 1985 complaint that led to a landmark document called the Flores settlement.

That agreement ultimately forced the U.S. government to stop housing children in austere detention centers run by Border Patrol officers and to instead direct children to more shelter-like conditions with education and exercise facilities run by ORR, a division of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

The new case, *Lucas R. v Azar*, for Alex Azar, current HHS secretary, claims the policies and practices of ORR are "causing grave harm to children detained for alleged civil violations" of crossing the border.

Lucas R. is the pseudonym that attorneys assigned to the 12-year-old from Guatemala detained in February.

The suit alleges the boy was placed in Hacienda del Sol, a shelter in Arizona run by the government contractor Southwest Key. When he arrived, the lawsuit says, staff noted that Lucas "appeared cooperative, calm, and alert, and showed 'no behavioral concerns.'"

"As his confinement wore on, however, Lucas became depressed, fearing that ORR would never release him to his family," the case alleges, and without seeking consent of his closest relative in the United States, the "ORR administered Lucas psychotropic drugs, ostensibly to control 'moderate' depression."

Meanwhile, the boy's adult sister, who lives in Los Angeles with her infant daughter, brother and a

roommate, had applied to be his sponsor and take custody of him from Hacienda del Sol.

But when investigators arrived to inspect her apartment, a friend of the roommate was visiting, the suit alleges. Agents said everyone in the home, including the friend would have to be fingerprinted for Lucas to be released to his sister's custody.

The friend's roommate did not show up for fingerprinting, and ORR informed the sister that Lucas would not be released to her.

For Lucas, the situation was deteriorating, the lawsuit alleges. The medication Zoloft was causing him stomach pain, and he began refusing to take the antidepressant. That led to his transfer to Shiloh Treatment Center in Texas. At that facility, a doctor who has signed off on many recent treatment plans has been operating on an expired state license, according to the Center for Investigative Reporting.

The lawsuit says: "Shiloh personnel have now diagnosed Lucas with 'major depressive disorder.' Among Lucas' 'major stressors,' Shiloh personnel identify his '[b]eing kept from family and in ORR custody.' Shiloh staff have nonetheless told Lucas that ORR will not release him until Shiloh medical personnel declare him psychologically sound."

In addition to the Center for Youth Law, other plaintiffs are the Center for Human Rights and Constitutional Law, University of California Davis School of Law Immigration Law Clinic, and Cooley LLP.

"We don't know what process ORR is using currently to reunite these children with their families and what we're seeing is that parents of children are going through the ringer trying to get their kids out of these detention facilities," Welch said. "There is no reason to think it is going to get any better."

Reunite Immigrant Kids With Their Families

[New York Times](#), June 29, 2018

The marches taking place across the country this weekend are really about the soul of America. Forcibly separating children from their parents is not about "deterrence," or the legal technicalities of law, or illegal immigration, or anything else President Trump has claimed to justify his latest and most odious outrage. It's about "Cruelty & perfidy scarcely paralleled in the most barbarous ages, and totally unworthy the Head of a civilized nation," to borrow from the Declaration of Independence.

No, the United States does not have clean hands: It has tolerated many inequities and atrocities throughout its history, toward Native Americans, blacks, Japanese

and women, among others. Yet against that is the tradition in American law, culture and practice to defend the weak, to welcome the other, to give refuge to the oppressed and to refuse to acquiesce when a government acts against basic dictates of conscience.

The Trump administration has committed a gross offense. It is the duty of every decent American to demand that it promptly reunite these children with their parents.

Lawsuit Challenges Trump Administration's Border-Detention Practices

The suit, which seeks class-action status, was filed on behalf of minors from Honduras, Guatemala, El Salvador and Mexico

By Alejandro Lazo

[Wall Street Journal](#), June 29, 2018

Full-text stories from the Wall Street Journal are available to Journal subscribers by clicking the link.

Inspector General: ICE Failed In Conditions At Child Detention Centers

By Brett Samuels

[The Hill](#), June 30, 2018

An inspector general report released this week found Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) does an inadequate job of inspecting its facilities and correcting poor practices.

The Department of Homeland Security's inspector general said in a report that ICE's detention centers do not regularly comply with agency standards, and cited a lack of follow-up on problems identified during sweeps at its roughly 200 facilities.

The inspector general was particularly critical of the Nakamoto Group, a company that is contracted to perform inspections at about 100 facilities each year. It called the company's inspection process "too broad," and "not always thorough."

When compiling their reports, some Nakamoto inspectors relied on answers from ICE employees who were not responsible for the areas the inspectors were asking about, according to the inspector general.

In other cases, Nakamoto inspectors spoke only English when interviewing detainees who did not speak English.

"In some instances, Nakamoto's reports misrepresented the level of assurance or the work performed in evaluating the actual conditions of the facility and the information in the reports was inconsistent with what we observed during inspections," the inspector general said.

By comparison, the report credited ICE's Office of Detention Oversight for effectively inspecting facilities, identifying problems and avoiding some of the same issues as Nakamoto Group.

However, it knocked the inspections as "too infrequent to ensure the facilities implement all deficiency corrections."

The inspector general issued five recommendations for improving ICE detention facilities. It called for revising the scope of inspections, reinstating a quality assurance program, developing a specific plan for facilities with numerous problems, updating procedures and implementing plans to verify and correct recurring issues.

In response to the report, ICE agreed with the recommendations and vowed to implement each one.

The inspector general report was released as ICE is facing protests in recent weeks for its role in the Trump administration's controversial "zero tolerance" policy on illegal immigration.

The policy, announced in April, led to the separation of thousands of migrant children from their parents.

Protests have broken out near ICE facilities in New York City, Washington, D.C., and Portland, Ore., in recent days, prompting the agency to put up barriers near entrances or after immigration hearings. Additional marches are expected nationwide on Saturday.

Some Democrats, including Sen. Kirsten Gillibrand (D-N.Y.), Rep. Mark Pocan (D-Wis.) and Earl Blumenauer (D-Ore.) have called for the agency to be abolished.

Parents And Children Remain Separated By Miles And Bureaucracy

By Annie Correal

[New York Times](#), June 30, 2018

Yeni González emerged into the warm evening air in Eloy, Ariz., her hair braided by the other women in the detention center. We're braiding up all your strength, they had told her in Spanish. You can do it.

Ms. González, who had been released on a bond, was meeting her lawyer on Thursday and would soon join the volunteers who were driving her to New York City to find her three young children — Lester, Jamelin and Deyuin — who had been taken away from her more than a month before at the southern border.

She is one of the rare ones.

With protests being held around the country on Saturday to demand the reunification of parents and children separated at the border, progress on putting families back together has been painfully slow. Despite a

federal judge's order requiring reunification within 30 days, more than 2,000 children remain scattered across 17 states, including some 300 in New York. Their parents too have been sent around the country — to detention centers in Arizona, Colorado and as far away as Washington State.

How will federal authorities reunite them? "There is no answer that I'm aware of about how the reunification will happen to the parents who are in detention," said Mario Russell, the director of Immigrant & Refugee Services for Catholic Charities, the nonprofit charged with representing the children sent to New York.

Officials at the Department of Health and Human Services said this week that they were facilitating communication between children and parents, but did not plan to release children while their parents were being detained. Under the Trump administration's "zero-tolerance" policy, thousands have been detained and face prosecution on charges of illegally entering the United States.

Citing the possibility that human traffickers might pose as parents, officials said that the government intends to aggressively "vet" those who wish to gain custody of children, including running background checks on them and requiring fingerprinting for every adult in their household, even if it slows down the reunification process.

The administration declined to say how many children had been reunited with their relatives since President Trump ended the separation policy with an executive order more than a week ago.

Yolany Padilla, 24, is one of about 50 parents who have been sent to two detention centers in Seattle. In a phone call from the Federal Detention Center at Seatac, she said the only trace she still has of Jelsin, her 6-year-old son, is the little case for his eyeglasses.

For close to a month after they were separated, she had no idea where he was.

She had been given a slip of paper with his alien number after they were separated at a detention center near Laredo, Tex., she said, but employees of Immigration and Customs Enforcement took it from her — along with their birth certificates and the backpacks she and Jelsin had carried from the tiny village of Los Puentes, Honduras. So it had been no use calling the toll-free number set up by the federal refugee office for separated families.

For weeks, she knew nothing. "I dreamed of him, sometimes bad things," she said, speaking in Spanish. "I couldn't sleep, I just hid under the blanket and cried."

Honduran consular officials recently came to the detention center looking for parents who had been separated from their children. And last week, Ms. Padilla

finally got a call from a social worker at Cayuga Centers, a child welfare agency in New York City.

"Oof," she said, "It felt like they lifted a huge weight off me."

When Jelsin got on the phone, Ms. Padilla said neither one of them could speak because they were both crying so hard. She coaxed a few words from her little boy, who she says loves to read and to ride his bicycle.

Yes, he was eating, he told her, but he didn't like the vegetables. They had cut his hair. He was one of six children staying in his foster home.

Ms. Padilla's case is particularly difficult to move forward, said her lawyer, Aimee Souza — who recently came on as a volunteer to represent Ms. Padilla in immigration court as she applies for asylum — because her client is being held in federal detention, which is more restrictive than immigration detention. "That throws 45 wrenches into the process," said Ms. Souza. "I can't easily get in there. I can't easily call. The only way to communicate is snail mail, visiting her," or waiting for her to call.

The Northwest Immigrant Rights Project filed a lawsuit in federal court this week challenging the administration's practice of family separation on behalf of the parents sent to Washington. Ms. Padilla is one of three plaintiffs named in the lawsuit.

Jorge Barón, the executive director of the organization, said it's unclear how the reunification process will play out.

He hopes that parents might be able to be released on bond, perhaps with ankle monitors, and then be reunited with their children while they await immigration hearings.

Alternatively, he said, "they could open new facilities and keep them together and locked up. But we're hoping that doesn't happen."

Even if parents are released on a bond, physically getting them across thousands of miles is difficult, especially if authorities hold their identification while the parents go through immigration proceedings. Without proper identification, they cannot board airplanes. That is why Ms. González, the mother held in Arizona, is being driven to New York by a team of volunteers.

Ms. González, who is from Guatemala, contacted relatives living in North Carolina after learning her children were in New York. The relatives contacted a lawyer there and sent him copies of the children's birth certificates.

The lawyer, José Xavier Orochena, then confirmed that the children — who are 6, 9 and 11 — were placed in foster homes through Cayuga, the largest of the agencies in New York.

After he spoke about the case on television and radio, a group of artists and parents in the New York area started a crowdfunding campaign for Ms. González that raised the money to cover her \$7,500 bond and arranged her cross-country trip.

"I feel very happy to be free, and very grateful for all the help," Ms. González, 29, said through tears after her release, speaking in Spanish. "I'm free and now I can fight for my children."

Mr. Orochena said he expected the family to be reunited for the first time early next week. "It's not unfettered, but Cayuga says she can see the children as much as she wants, from 9 to 5."

Their relative in North Carolina has applied to become the children's sponsor, meaning that the children might not have to remain in federal custody while their mother's asylum case makes its way through immigration court — a solution that many families might pursue.

But that too could complicate things. Every adult living in a child's house must be included in the sponsorship petition. So Ms. González might not be allowed to live with her children.

But at least she will be near them. Many more parents will likely remain in detention for some time, thousands of miles from their children. "I tell myself, God will help us, because we are not criminals," said Ms. Padilla, the mother being held in Seattle.

There, she waits in her tan-colored prison uniform for her son's calls, and turns his nine-digit alien number over in her mind like a rosary.

Media Outlets Unite To Track Down Migrant Children Separated From Parents Under Trump Policy

By Morgan Gstalter

[The Hill](#), June 30, 2018

Six news organizations are partnering together to track down information about the migrant children being held in detention centers and shelters across the country after being separated from their families upon crossing the U.S.-Mexico border.

BuzzFeed News announced this week that it was uniting with ProPublica, The Intercept, Univision News, Animal Politico and Plaza Publica to gather research about the Trump administration's "zero tolerance" policy, which seeks to prosecute anyone crossing into the U.S. illegally via the southern border.

"Amid a heated national debate about the policy, actual information about the whereabouts and welfare of separated children is hard to come by," BuzzFeed said in a statement Wednesday.

The media outlets said they hope to crowdsource information because the federal government is not providing any to state agencies.

Thousands of protesters gathered across the country on Saturday for "Families Belong Together" marches protesting the Trump administration's immigration policies.

President Trump has faced severe backlash in recent weeks for his administration's zero tolerance immigration policy, which led to more than 2,000 migrant children being separated from their parents from April to May.

Images of children being detained behind cages and sounds of kids crying for their parents sparked national outrage, eventually forcing Trump to sign an executive order ending the practice of family separations.

Thousands of families have yet to be reunited.

U.S. District Court Judge Dana Sabraw ordered the administration on Tuesday to immediately move to reunify immigrant families.

Sabraw criticized the practice of separating families without "an effective system or procedure" for tracking where the children were being sent.

Fast-tracking Of Illegal Border Crossing Cases Coming To California Soon

By Kristina Davis

[Los Angeles Times](#), June 30, 2018

On a recent Friday, a group of visitors from San Diego that included attorneys and a federal judge sat in a Tucson courtroom and watched as illegal border entry cases were adjudicated from start to finish in a matter of hours.

Dozens of unauthorized immigrants, wearing the same clothes they were arrested in at the border just a day or two earlier, pleaded guilty and were sentenced by a rotating panel of judges showing off their individual styles, according to a report in the Arizona Daily Star.

The San Diego delegation was taking notes on Tucson's program — known there and in other Southwest border cities as Operation Streamline — because a similar fast-track system is headed to California to handle the burgeoning caseload under the Trump administration's "zero tolerance" crackdown on illegal immigration.

The program is tentatively set to begin in San Diego federal court on July 9, according to attorneys.

Operation Streamline was first introduced by the Border Patrol in Texas in 2005 under a different zero-tolerance policy. The program has survived in a few districts, with the overriding goal to prosecute a larger

number of people crossing the border illegally by speeding up the process. It was not used in California.

Supporters say criminally prosecuting illegal border crossings serves as a stronger deterrent than just civil deportations.

Critics claim the expedited program jeopardizes defendants' right to due process and have called it "assembly line justice."

Exactly how a fast-track program will work in San Diego is still unclear. A committee including federal judges, prosecutors and defense attorneys has been hammering out the details.

"We are committed to securing the border by enforcing criminal immigration laws in a way that respects due process and the dignity of all involved," U.S. Attorney's Office spokeswoman Kelly Thornton said. "We are working collaboratively with the court, the defense bar and law enforcement to set up a process that accomplishes both goals."

In a June 22 letter sent to the chief judge of the Southern District of California — on the same day as the Tucson visit — the federal defense bar reiterated its objections to a "separate" court. The letter then offered several suggestions as to how to frame the program in a way that would still balance the duty to protect their clients.

"So though we offer these suggestions, that duty of loyalty will compel us to challenge these and any other set of procedures that impair either our clients' dignity and humanity or the exercise of their constitutional rights," the letter warns. It is signed by Reuben Cahn, executive director of Federal Defenders of San Diego, and Jami Ferrara, an attorney who represents a panel of private attorneys who are also appointed by the court to serve as public defenders.

The letter provides the first detailed insight into how the program might run in San Diego.

The biggest concession defense attorneys are asking for is to make the program a five-day process, with defendants being arraigned one day, then appearing in court on the fifth day to plead guilty and be sentenced — or in some cases to request a trial.

The time frame is longer than in places that have operated Streamline programs. Tucson's is a same-day process, while Las Cruces, N.M., is a three-day program and Del Rio, Texas, is two days.

"We do not believe a one-day plea and sentencing system is feasible or constitutional," the letter states.

Ideally, unauthorized immigrants who were either arrested the previous day or overnight would be available to be interviewed by defense attorneys in the morning, according to the letter. And in the afternoon during a hearing, a judge would advise the defendants of

the charges against them, explain their rights, appoint counsel and discuss bail.

Defense attorneys would have a few days to follow up with their clients to review the evidence and discuss how to proceed. Then on the fifth day, the defendants would be back in court for a hearing to either plead guilty and be sentenced, or to request a trial. Misdemeanor defendants have a right to a bench trial, but not a jury trial.

The letter suggests putting four public defender attorneys and four eligible private attorneys per day on a duty rotation to handle the day's calendar.

The letter also requests that the defendants participating in this special court be housed in a detention facility nearby — either Metropolitan Correctional Center or Western Region Detention Facility, otherwise known as GEO — to ensure easy access to clients during the short turnaround between arraignment and sentencing.

The defense bar also asked for a system that would carefully track separated families and make it easier for reunification after the criminal case has been adjudicated.

Among the requests is a court order that directs prosecutors to ask arresting agents to identify instances of family separation, as well as an order requiring the defense to be provided with the location of the separated children, a contact number and each child's "A number," or "alien number."

A process should also be implemented to make it easier for the families to be detained together once the criminal process is over and they are put into removal proceedings, the letter states.

An influx of defendants who don't speak English or Spanish has also caused for communication issues, and defense attorneys are asking for court interpreters who speak other languages — including a common indigenous language, Mixteco — to be made available for client interviews beforehand.

Another hot-button issue that frequently comes up during federal court hearings concerns the shackling of defendants in court. Federal Defenders of San Diego filed lawsuits over the practice a few years ago and the cases were litigated up to the U.S. Supreme Court, but the issue was never truly decided when the court found the detainees no longer had legal standing to bring the case.

Since then, the U.S. Marshals Service has gone back to routinely shackling all types of defendants by the ankles in pretrial hearings.

In its letter, the federal bar argues that defendants who will be appearing in this special court will be there for misdemeanor illegal entry, not violent crimes.

"At the recent Border Courts Conference in El Paso, the Arizona bench reported that Streamline clients appearing without shackles were calmer, more at ease during their colloquies and that the clients appeared 'more engaged,'" the letter states.

The impact of zero tolerance — the Trump administration's vow to criminally prosecute everyone crossing the border illegally — has been felt across the federal criminal justice system in San Diego since mid-May.

The pressure has caused more delays in processing defendants in time for court, prompted more drug cases to be kicked to Superior Court and resulted in longer than usual hearings.

In the last two months, prosecutors have filed more than 1,300 cases of misdemeanor illegal entry at the border in San Diego and Imperial counties, according to a San Diego Union-Tribune analysis. That's compared to 154 such cases filed during the same period last year, when authorities were instead targeting unauthorized immigrants who had serious criminal records or a history of multiple illegal crossings.

Consider last Monday's marathon duty court calendar, which didn't end until 10 p.m.

Prosecutors brought just under 100 cases that day — most immigration related, and the vast majority misdemeanor illegal entry charges.

Overseeing the courtroom was the Hon. Clinton Averitte, a retired magistrate judge from Texas who was brought in to help manage the caseload in the face of several judicial vacancies the court is dealing with.

The morning calendar went through the lunch hour until almost 1 p.m. and started up again at 2 p.m. By 5 p.m., when day's arraignments would typically be winding down, if not over, they weren't even halfway through, said federal public defender Whitney Bernstein.

Federal defenders filed 49 writs of habeas corpus, assuming those clients wouldn't be seen by the day's end, and demanded they be produced in a timely manner or their charges dismissed.

Rather than continue those remaining cases to the next day as many judges have done, Averitte vowed to get through the long list of defendants.

One prosecutor had to leave for other obligations, and federal defenders and the marshals who'd been there since the morning called in backup.

The public defenders asked to bring in another judge to help divide the caseload, and also objected that as the evening wore on, the hearing was no longer public because the front doors to the downtown courthouse had been locked. The judge still plowed ahead.

"The government is choosing to prosecute many, many individuals, and the Constitution requires that all these people — regardless of the crime or the person charged — be given due process," Bernstein said. "We are here to guarantee that this happens and we won't go home until we are satisfied that this process has occurred."

Davis writes for the San Diego Union-Tribune.

Trump Administration May Seek To Detain Migrant Families Longer Than Previously Allowed

By Devlin Barrett

[Washington Post](#), June 29, 2018

The Trump administration plans to detain migrant families together in custody rather than release them, according to a new court filing that suggests such detentions could last longer than the 20 days envisioned by a court settlement.

"The government will not separate families but detain families together during the pendency of immigration proceedings when they are apprehended at or between ports of entry," Justice Department lawyers wrote in a legal notice to a federal judge in California who has been overseeing long-running litigation about the detention of undocumented immigrants.

The filing comes as the Justice Departments seeks to navigate two different court edicts — an injunction issued this week by a federal judge in San Diego that required the government to begin reuniting the roughly 2,000 migrant children still separated from their families, and an older court settlement in federal court in Los Angeles that requires the immigration agencies to release minors in their custody if they are held for more than 20 days.

In the weeks since Attorney General Jeff Sessions announced a zero-tolerance policy toward immigrants illegally crossing the U.S. border, roughly 2,500 migrant children were separated from their parents. About 500 of those children have since been reunited with their parents.

On Tuesday, U.S. District Court Judge Dana M. Sabraw in San Diego issued a preliminary injunction ordering the government to quickly reunite migrant children with their parents, saying that children separated from their families must be returned within 30 days, and allowing just 14 days for the return of children under age 5.

Under the framework of a previous court settlement in the Los Angeles case, the Department of Homeland Security has followed a general practice of

not keeping migrant children in the custody of immigration agents for more than 20 days.

The new filing does not explicitly say the Trump administration plans to hold families in custody beyond the 20-day limit, but by saying officials plan to detain them “during the pendency” of immigration proceedings, which in many cases can last months, it implies that families will spend that time in detention.

The Justice Department argued that while the previous settlement had compelled it to release minors “without unnecessary delay,” the new court order, “which requires that the minor be kept with the parent, makes delay necessary in these circumstances.”

President Trump has demanded an end to what critics call “catch and release” — the practice of releasing migrants from immigration detention, many of whom do not show up later for their court hearings. The administration has said 40,579 deportation orders were issued because foreigners did not appear for their hearing in the last budget year.

Civil rights groups and immigrant advocates are likely to seek additional legal action if migrant families are detained for months. What’s less clear is how the judge in the Los Angeles case, Dolly M. Gee, will view the new approach by the government, and whether she will order it changed.

The filing could spur the judge to approve long-term family detentions. Alternately, the judge may order the administration to release families with monitoring bracelets — though that could provide a political opening for President Trump and other administration officials to blame the judiciary for forcing them to let illegal immigrants into the country.

Leon Fresco, who served as deputy assistant attorney general for the Office of Immigration Litigation in the Obama administration, said officials had always had the ability to hold kids with families past 20 days — if the parents consented to it. But under President Barack Obama, Fresco said, officials felt it would be too cruel to present mothers with a Sophie’s choice between turning their child over to refugee resettlement authorities, or keeping them detained.

The latest filing, he said, indicated that the Trump administration would be at least willing to do that.

“What they want to do is put the choice to the mom, separate or not separate, but make the choice so onerous that there really is no option other than to stay in family detention,” Fresco said.

Trump Admin Likely To Detain Migrant Families For Months During Immigration Proceedings: Report

By John Bowden

[The Hill](#), June 29, 2018

The Trump administration may detain migrant families together for months at detention facilities as they await prosecution for illegal entry, according to a court filing from the Justice Department.

The Washington Post reported Friday that Trump administration lawyers wrote in a legal notice to a judge in California that the federal government would hold migrant families at detention facilities for “the pendency of immigration proceedings when they are apprehended at or between ports of entry.”

While the filing does not specify the length of expected detention for migrant families — and whether the administration plans to hold them past a 20-day limit — the Post noted that immigration proceedings are known to last for months.

Immigration judges have faced an overwhelming caseload under the Trump administration’s “zero tolerance” policy mandating the prosecution of all migrants suspected of illegally crossing the border.

The administration attorneys argued Friday that a previous order from a judge to reunite migrant children with their parents “without unnecessary delay” is invalid after President Trump signed an executive order ending family separations. The new policy, “which requires that the minor be kept with the parent, makes delay necessary in these circumstances.”

The court filing comes after Health and Human Services (HHS) Secretary Alex Azar told the Senate Finance Committee earlier this week that it was up to Congress or the courts to reunite the 2,047 migrant children still in his agency’s custody.

“We are working to get all these kids ready to be placed back with their parents as soon as Congress passes a change, or if those parents complete their immigration proceedings,” Azar said Tuesday. “We do not want any children separated from their parents any longer than necessary under the law.”

The Trump administration’s court filing indicates that it is attempting to force a modification of the Flores settlement, a 1997 court ruling that stipulates that minor children who are “accompanied” by their parents crossing the border illegally must be released into HHS care within 20 days.

The Department of Justice asked a federal district court to modify it last week amid the current border crisis, but no ruling has been issued yet.

U.S. Government Says It Will Detain Migrant Children With Parents

[Reuters](#), June 30, 2018

Full-text stories from Reuters currently cannot be included in this document. You may, however, click the link above to access the story.

US Lawyers: Ruling Allows Detention Of Immigrant Families

By Astrid Galvan

[Associated Press](#), June 29, 2018

PHOENIX (AP) – The Trump administration says a ruling this week by a federal judge in San Diego requiring the government to reunify families separated at the border means authorities can legally keep families detained until their cases are complete.

The interpretation means immigrant families could spend months or even years in detention – even those seeking asylum – because of a years-long backlog in immigration court.

The Justice Department has said cases in which immigrants remain detained move through the system quicker than if they are released, but the backlog is still thousands of cases deep.

The Department of Justice said in a court filing Friday in Los Angeles that a case known as the Flores agreement allows the government to detain families now that the California judge has barred their separation.

“The Trump Administration has been engaged – since January of 2017 – in restoring order to the lawlessness at the Southwest border and protecting our nation’s citizens, but we are beholden to a broken immigration system that Congress has refused to fix and that courts have exacerbated,” the department said in a news release.

The Flores agreement is a long-standing guide as to how and how long the government can detain immigrant children. It stems from a lawsuit filed in 1985 by an immigrant girl, Jenny Lisette Flores, who was detained by immigration authorities in poor conditions and who was not allowed to be released to an aunt.

The Flores agreement requires the government to release children from immigration detention “without unnecessary delay,” which the government has generally interpreted to mean about 20 days.

But the DOJ is zeroing in on the requirement, saying the order this week from U.S. District Court Judge Dana Sabraw requires that children’s release be delayed so that they can stay with their parents.

Sabraw set a 30-day deadline for reuniting parents and children and called for young children to be reunited more quickly.

The ACLU is disputing the Trump administration’s interpretation of the ruling.

Lee Gelernt, deputy director of its Immigrants’ Rights Project, said the government has a constitutional obligation to release parents who don’t pose a flight risk or danger, and that parents can choose to release their children if they don’t want them to be in a family detention center.

“Ultimately the (San Diego) case leaves it up to parents to decide what is in the best interests of the child,” Gelernt said. “It would be flatly unconstitutional if the government’s purpose in detaining families is punitive or is intended to serve as a deterrent.”

The administration has long-argued that releasing asylum-seekers who cross the border illegally amounts to catch-and-release and results in many not showing up for their court hearings.

The administration says it is enforcing a zero-tolerance policy requiring border agents to arrest and prosecute anyone caught crossing the border illegally. That resulted in more than 2,000 children being separated from their parents.

Copyright 2018 Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten, or redistributed.

Trump Administration Argues It Can Detain Migrant Children And Parents Together Without Time Limits

By Gregory Korte And Alan Gomez

[USA Today](#), June 29, 2018

WASHINGTON — The Trump administration argued Friday that it has the authority to hold migrant children in custody with their parents for as long as it takes to resolve their immigration cases, a departure from the long-standing practice of releasing minors from detention after 20 days.

In a court filing late Friday, the Justice Department said it would fully comply with a judge’s order to reunite families it has separated as a result of President Donald Trump’s “zero tolerance” policy. But the government’s attorneys argued that they can detain those families together and remain in compliance with a series of U.S. laws and court orders.

More than 2,000 migrant children have been separated from parents suspected of crossing the border illegally as the Trump administration has jailed the parents. The international outcry over the practice has prompted the administration to find a way to both detain parents and keep them together with their children.

“We understand the courts to have provided that minors who are apprehended with families may not be separated from their parents where it is determined that continued detention is appropriate for the parent,” said

acting Assistant Attorney General Chad Readler in the court filing.

More: People will march in all 50 states to protest Trump's 'zero tolerance' immigration policy

Families Belong Together 101: What to expect at your first protest

Also: What you need to know before Saturday's immigration protests

But what that also means, he said, is that the government should not have to release either the parents or the children within the time frames of the Flores settlement, a 1997 court ruling that set a 20-day limit on the detention of minors.

Prosecutions of illegal immigration cases often take months to resolve. To comply with the 20-day limit and keep parents and children together would require releasing families from custody during court proceedings.

"The government will not separate families but detain families together during the pendency of immigration proceedings when they are apprehended at or between ports of entry," the Justice Department told a California judge overseeing the Flores settlement.

That ruling requires children to be released "without unnecessary delay." But when read in conjunction with a San Diego judge's ruling this week that children be reunified with their parents within 30 days — 14 days if they're aged 5 or younger — that delay is necessary, the Justice Department argued.

And if parents want their children to be released from detention, they could always agree to a separation, the government said.

The filing amounts to something of a change in legal strategy for the Trump administration. Trump's executive order last week sought a modification of the Flores settlement allowing it "to detain alien families together throughout the pendency of criminal proceedings."

So eight days ago, the Justice Department argued that under current rulings, "it is not possible for the U.S. government to detain families together during the pendency of their immigration proceedings. It cannot be done."

Now, it argues that it can be done under current law — although a modification "would be appropriate."

What changed? On Tuesday, U.S. District Judge Dana Sabraw ordered the Trump administration to reunite families in detention. But he also made clear that under his ruling, "government would remain free to enforce its criminal and immigration laws, and to exercise its discretion in matters of release and detention consistent with law."

Contributing: Alan Gomez reported from Miami.

Exclusive: Trump DOJ Plan Would Bar Most Central Americans From Asylum

By Dara Lind

[Vox](#), June 29, 2018

The Department of Justice, under Attorney General Jeff Sessions, is drafting a plan that would totally overhaul asylum policy in the United States.

Under the plan, people would be barred from getting asylum if they came into the US between ports of entry and were prosecuted for illegal entry. It would also add presumptions that would make it extremely difficult for Central Americans to qualify for asylum, and codify — in an even more restrictive form — an opinion written by Sessions in June that attempted to restrict asylum for victims of domestic and gang violence.

Vox has confirmed that the regulation is in the process of being evaluated, and has seen a copy of a draft of the regulation.

When the regulation is ready, it will be published in the Federal Register as a notice of proposed rulemaking, with 90 days for the public to comment before it's enacted as a final regulation.

The version Vox saw may change before it's finalized, or even before the proposal is published in the Federal Register. (The Department of Justice declined to comment.)

But as it exists now, the proposal is a sweeping and thorough revamp of asylum — tightening the screws throughout the asylum process.

One source familiar with the asylum process but not authorized to speak on the record described the proposed changes as "the most severe restrictions on asylum since at least 1965" — when the law that created the current legal immigration system was passed — and "possibly even further back."

The Immigration and Nationality Act gives the attorney general, along with the Department of Homeland Security, discretion over asylum standards — saying that the government "may grant asylum" to an applicant who they determine meets the definition of a refugee. But the proposed regulation would make it nearly impossible for Central Americans, including families, to earn the government's approval.

It would eliminate the path that thousands of Central Americans, including families, take every month to seek asylum in the US: entering between ports of entry and presenting themselves to Border Patrol agents. It would make it all but impossible for victims of domestic or gang violence to qualify for asylum — going even further than a June decision from Sessions that sought to limit asylum access for those groups. It would create a presumption against Central Americans who

travel through Mexico on their way to the US. Anyone convicted of entering the US illegally would become ineligible for asylum

What happens under current policy: Under the Trump administration's "zero tolerance" initiative, all migrants who cross between ports of entry and are apprehended by Border Patrol are supposed to be criminally prosecuted for illegal entry.

That arrest can delay a person's claim of asylum, but it doesn't derail it. An asylum-seeker may not get their initial screening interview, which determines whether they'll be allowed to file an asylum application and get a hearing, until after they've been prosecuted and convicted. And they definitely won't get approved for asylum before their criminal conviction.

But the conviction for illegal entry doesn't affect the asylum claim; as Customs and Border Protection puts it, the two are on "parallel tracks."

What would happen under the new plan: The proposed regulation would bar anyone from getting asylum if they'd been convicted of illegal entry or illegal reentry. That means people who asked for asylum when they were apprehended at the border, but were prosecuted first, would get denied asylum.

In effect, under this new regulation, combined with the zero-tolerance prosecution initiative, no one would be able to come to the US and get asylum unless they presented themselves at a port of entry. Many asylum-seekers simply don't have that option. Smugglers often prevent asylum-seekers from using official ports of entry, and many of those who do come to ports of entry are being forced to wait days or weeks, after being told there's no room to process them right now. And asylum-seekers who come to ports of entry are often required to stay in immigration detention without bond until their case is complete.

The administration would almost certainly get sued over this provision if it ended up included in the finalized regulation. The Department of Justice (DOJ) has the power to bar people from getting asylum (or other forms of relief from deportation) if they've committed "particularly serious crimes." While there's no definition of seriousness in the law, lawyers and immigration advocates would likely challenge the idea that illegal entry, a misdemeanor, is "particularly serious."

But even if that provision is struck down or eliminated by the courts, another proposal in the draft regulation could have much the same effect. It would instruct immigration judges to consider how the asylum-seeker got into the US, and treat it as a significant factor in whether or not to grant asylum (since asylum-seekers have to show they deserve "favorable discretion" from the judge). So even if people who crossed between ports

of entry weren't officially banned from getting asylum, they would have a very hard time winning their cases in practice.

If adopted, the regulation, combined with the zero tolerance initiative, would allow the administration to set up assembly-line justice for asylum seekers, including families, entering the US. People who entered between official ports would be held by the Department of Homeland Security, prosecuted for illegal entry, convicted, then have their asylum applications denied and get deported.

While the Trump administration is currently trying to win the power to detain families for more than 20 days, if this regulation were enacted, they might not even need to. They could deny most asylum claims and deport the claimants within that time. Victims of domestic or gang violence would be all but banned from asylum

What happens under current policy: US law limits asylum to people who are persecuted because of their race, religion, political opinions, nationality, or membership in a particular social group.

The government has been wrestling for decades with that last classification — what exactly counts as a "particular social group"? — and with whether someone is "persecuted" if they're victimized by someone other than the government. These questions are key to the fate of many of the Central Americans (including children and families) who have come to the US to seek asylum in recent years, many of whom are claiming asylum based on domestic violence or gang victimization in their home countries.

In June, with a sweeping ruling overturning a case from the Board of Immigration Appeals, Sessions attempted to narrow the circumstances in which someone fleeing domestic or gang violence could qualify for asylum in the US — saying that, generally, victims of domestic or gang violence wouldn't be eligible for asylum based on their victimization.

As I reported last week, though, US Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) has been cautious in implementing Sessions's opinion. Most notably, while Sessions decreed that his ruling overturned any precedent that contradicted it, USCIS only told asylum officers to stop using the one precedent decision Sessions explicitly named as moot.

It looks like the DOJ may be trying to use regulation to accomplish the same goal — with even narrower definitions of "persecuted" and "particular social group."

What would happen under the plan: The proposed regulation would add several restrictions to what could constitute a particular social group: a family, for example, wouldn't be a social group unless the family had a visible

national presence. Interpersonal violence or crime victimization, similarly, wouldn't be the basis for social group membership unless they were happening on a national scale. Having been recruited by a gang would be explicitly prohibited as grounds for an asylum claim.

To qualify for asylum, an applicant would have to show that the people who persecuted her were also persecuting others on the same basis. Human-rights lawyers worry this could disqualify many legitimate asylum claims. One lawyer raises the example of a gay man in Russia who suffers a violent homophobic attack: Under the proposal, "this would not be persecution on account of sexual orientation unless you could prove that these attackers had previously persecuted other gay men."

An asylum-seeker would be required to provide an exact definition of her "particular social group" when she was applying for asylum. And she wouldn't be allowed to appeal a denial, or reopen a claim, on the basis of any group she hadn't originally named.

It's extremely difficult for anyone other than a trained immigration lawyer to know exactly what does and doesn't count as a particular social group eligible for asylum. Under the proposed regulation, however, an asylum-seeker who didn't know the precise nature of the basis for her persecution would be assumed to not really be a victim of persecution at all.

This standard wouldn't just apply to final approvals or denials of asylum. The initial step for an asylee is what's called a "credible fear" screening, during which an asylum officer decides whether the person has a credible fear of going back to their home country. The proposed rule would tighten standards for those, too.

Immigration lawyers and border advocates were already extremely concerned that Sessions's May ruling would cause asylum officers to radically hike the standards for passing the screening interview (though the USCIS memo posted by Vox suggests that might not be the case just yet). If this regulation were finalized, however, it seems very possible that many people who are currently given the opportunity to apply for asylum would be turned away before they got the chance. Central Americans would be penalized for not seeking asylum in Mexico

What happens under current policy: Many asylum seekers are Central Americans who come through Mexico to seek asylum in the US. The US is not allowed to simply turn them back and force them to seek asylum in Mexico instead. (The Trump administration is trying to get Mexico to sign a "safe third country" agreement that would allow them to do this, but Mexico appears unenthusiastic.) But the proposed regulation would make

it a lot easier to deny their asylum claims based on not having sought asylum in Mexico first.

What would happen under the plan: Under the proposed rule, the government would generally withhold "favorable discretion" (and, therefore, deny the asylum claim) for anyone who had spent more than two weeks in another country en route to the US without seeking asylum there, or who had traveled through more than one country on the way to the US.

Many Central Americans, especially if they take the train through Mexico or travel on foot, take more than two weeks to travel through Mexico. And asylum-seekers from Honduras and El Salvador cross through Guatemala and Mexico to get to the US — meaning that they would almost certainly not earn the "favorable discretion" required to get their asylum claim approved. Tightening the screws on the entire asylum process

The proposed regulation is extremely broad, with a lot more provisions — all of which would make it much harder for people to seek and get asylum. Some of the remaining ideas in the proposed draft include:

Limiting appeals for asylum-seekers who fail their screening interviews. Under current law, if an asylum-seeker fails her initial "credible fear" interview with an asylum officer, she can appeal for a judge to review her claim with fresh eyes — ignoring the fact that the asylum officer hadn't found it a credible claim. Under the proposed regulation, judges would only be able to approve a credible-fear claim on appeal if there was clear evidence that the asylum officer had screwed up.

Rejecting incomplete applications first and letting them get completed later. Instead of returning incomplete asylum applications to the applicant and asking her to complete it, the government would reject the application. The applicant would still have 60 days to complete and resubmit the application before it was officially denied, but it's not clear how applicants would be told about that — or whether they'd read beyond the word "rejected."

Allowing judges to put evidence into the record on their own. The proposal would allow immigration judges considering asylum cases to unilaterally insert any information from credible sources into the record (as long as both the prosecutor and defense were informed). This provision would make it much easier for judges to insert information claiming that an asylum-seeker's home country isn't as dangerous for him as he claims — since asylum cases often hinge on whether there's anywhere safe in the home country the asylum-seeker could live instead of the US.

Immigrants could be barred from asylum based on traffic offenses... In addition to the new prohibitions on asylum for immigration-specific crimes, the regulation

would ban any applicant who'd been convicted of two or three misdemeanors (depending on what they were) from getting asylum.

This would have the biggest impact on unauthorized immigrants living in the US who get arrested and put in deportation proceedings, but ask for asylum to avert their deportation. (Under asylum law, someone can ask for asylum at any point within their first year of living in the US.)

In immigration policy, traffic offenses like driving without a license often don't count as misdemeanors because in many states unauthorized immigrants aren't allowed to get licenses. But the draft regulation makes clear that if driving without a license is a misdemeanor in the jurisdiction in question, it counts toward ineligibility.

...and blue states can't fix eligibility by expunging immigrants' records. Some Democratic state officials (most notably Gov. Jerry Brown in California) have started to use the pardon power to clear the criminal records of immigrants facing deportation. This regulation would do an end-run around that strategy.

Convictions that had been expunged or otherwise modified after the fact would still count as convictions if there was any evidence that the criminal record had been altered for immigration purposes. In other words, if Brown tried to expunge a record to make someone eligible for asylum, the fact that that's why he did it would prevent it from stopping their deportation.

Report: DOJ Planning To Tighten Asylum Rules

By Rafael Bernal

[The Hill](#), June 29, 2018

The Department of Justice is considering revamping asylum regulations to bar anyone who enters the country illegally from applying, according to a report on Vox.

The new regulation would overhaul the existing asylum system, and would add rules making it extremely difficult for Central Americans to successfully apply for asylum in the United States, according to the report.

Vox reviewed a draft plan of the regulation. The Department of Justice did not immediately return a request for comment on the Vox report.

The proposed regulation's main provision would be to bar people accused of illegal entry from gaining asylum, Vox reported.

Under current law, immigrants who enter the country between ports of entry are criminally prosecuted for illegal entry while their immigration cases — including requests for asylum — are reviewed in parallel.

The Trump administration since April has enforced a zero-tolerance policy on illegal entry, remanding even first time illegal entrants to the Department of Justice for criminal prosecution.

To avoid charges of illegal entry, those seeking asylum must enter the country at designated ports of entry.

In many cases, asylum seekers are channeled between ports of entry by smugglers, or choose not to stay at designated entry points to wait for U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) agents to process their initial claims.

The waits at designated ports of entry can sometimes extend for weeks.

According to the report, the new regulation would also tighten who would be able to apply for asylum by tightening the definition of a persecuted "particular social group."

Asylum law allows claims from people persecuted because of their race, religion, political opinions, nationality, or membership in a particular social group.

The new regulation would force people to define that group, and would eliminate some cases in which a family could fit that description.

DOJ is also seeking to involve Mexico more deeply in the asylum/refugee process concerning Central Americans, a role that Mexico has so far declined to take.

In May, U.S. and Mexican officials met to discuss the possibility of Mexico declaring itself a "safe third country."

Under international law, asylum seekers and refugees on the move are required to apply for safe haven in the first safe country they enter.

Mexico has so far been considered a transit country as it faces criminal threats similar to those in Central America, and Central American migrants are often specifically targeted as they cross the country to get to the U.S. border.

While the Trump administration has so far been unsuccessful in getting Mexico to sign a safe third country agreement, the proposed regulation would make it easier for U.S. immigration judges to deny asylum to people who go through Mexico without requesting asylum there first.

The proposal would also instruct immigration judges to rule against applicants who traverse more than one country on their way to the United States, effectively barring Honduran and El Salvadorean migrants, who must cross Guatemala and Mexico to get to the United States.

And the proposal would also change how immigration judges weigh misdemeanors, other than

illegal entry, committed in the United States by asylum seekers.

The regulation would bar immigrants from receiving asylum if they commit two or three misdemeanors.

The regulation would also direct immigration judges to ignore pardons granted by state officials with the intent of simplifying applicants' immigration claims.

Report: Draft DOJ Rule Would Deny Asylum For Illegal Border Crossers

[Axios](#), June 29, 2018

The Justice Department is drafting a rule that would prevent immigrants who are criminally prosecuted for crossing the border illegally from being granted asylum, and increase scrutiny toward Central American asylum seekers, reports Vox's Dara Lind, who saw a draft of the rule.

Why it matters: Attorney General Jeff Sessions implemented the zero-tolerance policy in order to deter immigrants from unlawfully crossing the border, and instead incentivize them to apply for asylum at legal ports of entry. But this approach takes that strategy to a whole new level.

If this draft became regulation, it would likely face legal pushback. Leon Fresco, a former DOJ immigration lawyer, told Axios it would be illegal to prevent someone from obtaining asylum simply because they crossed the border without permission.

What's next: The draft is being evaluated and, once finalized, will be posted in the Federal Registrar no fewer than 90 days before the regulation is official, according to Vox.

The impact, per Vox:

The new rule would make victims of domestic or gang violence unlikely to qualify for asylum.

It would disqualify any immigrants who present themselves to border patrol agents in between the legal ports of entry — a common way for asylum-seekers to make their claims.

As of right now, even the immigrants who have been criminally charged with improper entry into the U.S. under Attorney General Jeff Sessions' "zero-tolerance" policy can claim asylum after their criminal hearings. The proposed rule would end that chance.

It would limit the appeals of asylum seekers who fail their "credible fear" interview and reject incomplete applications.

It would make the question of how an asylum-seeker got into the U.S., and whether they spent more than 2 weeks in a different country before applying for

asylum, an important factor in immigration judges' decisions.

Why this matters: This is something administration officials have advocated for in calls with reporters, especially during the furor over a Central American "caravan" of immigrants moving toward the U.S. border. Their argument is, essentially, if someone is really desperate enough to claim asylum, they should do so in the first country they pass through.

The bottom line: This is just a draft rule, and will likely go through some changes before we see the final version. If enacted, the regulation would make the asylum-seeking process much faster, but at the the price of denying many more claims.

Top House Dems Demand Broad Watchdog Investigations Into Trump Immigration Policy

By Nathaniel Weixel

[The Hill](#), June 29, 2018

Top House Democrats are asking federal agency watchdogs for a broad investigation into the Trump administration's "zero tolerance" immigration policies, including the separation of children from their parents, as well as the recent executive order intended to partially roll them back.

The lawmakers sent a letter Friday to the inspectors general of the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Homeland Security, and the Department of Justice asking for a review of the administration's entire process for planning and implementing its immigration plan.

"We have grave concerns about how the Department of Justice, Department of Homeland Security, and Department of Health and Human Services considered, prepared for, and executed these policies," the Democrats wrote.

The letter was signed by Reps. Elijah E. Cummings (Md.), Jerry Nadler (N.Y.), Bennie Thompson (Miss.), Bobby Scott (Va.), and Frank Pallone, Jr. (N.J.), the top Democrats on the House Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, the Judiciary, Homeland Security, Education and the Workforce, and Energy and Commerce, respectively.

The lawmakers expressed concern that the agencies failed to put in place adequate protocols to reunite children and their parents before implementing the policy.

They said reports also indicate that the Trump administration has been deporting parents alone and may be coercing parents to waive their legal rights and

leave the country in order to be reunited with their children.

HHS's Office of Refugee Resettlement currently has over 2,000 children in custody who were separated from their parents after being brought across the southern border illegally.

The Trump administration's "zero tolerance" immigration policy called for the separations, but an executive order the president signed last week amid intense political pressure was intended to keep families together while in detention.

A federal judge this week ordered the Trump administration to return immigrant children younger than five to their parents within two weeks. Children five and older must be reunited within 30 days.

But so far, the administration has failed to answer questions about how many children have been reunited with their parents since the order was signed, and has given little indication that it has a plan to reunite the children with their parents.

"The administration still has not provided consistent information on a family reunification plan, whether children are still being separated at the border, or whether your agencies have accurate information about whether detained children entered the United States as unaccompanied minors or were separated from their parents upon entry," the Democrats wrote.

"We also have serious questions about whether public statements by officials at each of your agencies were based on facts or matched the internal decision-making process that led to the implementation of these policies," the letter continued.

The HHS inspector general has already announced an investigation into the treatment of migrant children at agency-run shelters. However, the investigation will only focus on health and safety concerns.

The Democrats in their letter said they support the effort, but asked that the investigation be expanded.

The Trump Administration Says It's A 'Myth' That Families That Ask For Asylum At Ports Of Entry Are Separated. It Happens Frequently, Records Show

By Paloma Esquivel

[Los Angeles Times](#), July 1, 2018

A woman named Mirian and her 18-month-old son reached Brownsville, Texas, early this year after fleeing Honduras, where the military had teargassed their home. She made her way to a port of entry and asked for asylum, according to court records.

Mirian had her identification, her son's birth certificate, which listed her as his mother, his hospital birth record and his vaccination records.

Border officers took the records, then told her they would be taking her boy, she said in a sworn court declaration. They walked her out to a government car, told her to put him in a car seat and closed the door.

It was three months before they were reunited.

The Trump administration's "zero-tolerance" policy of criminally charging people who cross the border illegally led to thousands of children being separated from their parents.

But the practice of separating families appears to have begun accelerating last year, long before zero tolerance was announced in the spring. Among these cases, according to records and interviews, are many that happened at ports of entry.

Administration officials have said repeatedly that asylum seekers who don't want to be separated from their children should present themselves at a port of entry. Doing so is the legal way to ask for asylum, they said.

But court filings describe numerous cases in recent months in which families were separated after presenting themselves at a port of entry to ask for asylum.

This happened even when asylum seekers carried records, such as birth certificates or hospital documents, listing them as the parents of their children, according to interviews and court records.

While border officials have long had a policy of separating children when their safety might be in question, lawyers and advocates say they began seeing a significant increase last year in officials separating children from their parents who asked for asylum at ports of entry, without clear reasons.

In a ruling Tuesday ordering the reunification of families in a case brought by the ACLU, San Diego federal court Judge Dana M. Sabraw wrote that there had been a "casual, if not deliberate, separation of families that lawfully present at the port of entry, not just those who cross into the country illegally."

Nicole Ramos, an attorney who provides legal help to asylum seekers in Tijuana, said she started to see an increase in family separations at ports of entry in May 2017.

Ramos has filed eight complaints related to this issue in recent months with the Department of Homeland Security's Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, which investigates civil rights violations.

Separations at ports of entry have happened "even when families have presented sufficient evidence of parentage, even where they do not have signs of neglect

or abuse ... even when the child is able to speak for themselves and say" this is my parent, Ramos said.

She said the problem has been compounded by long wait times at ports of entry. In some cases, families have been left waiting for weeks to claim asylum at a border crossing.

Lee Gelernt, the lead attorney on the ACLU's case challenging family separations, said the government has justified taking children in some cases by saying there was concern a child was with a smuggler.

In one case, he said, "the little girl was screaming 'Mommy, mommy, don't let them take me away.' Anyone would have known it was not a smuggler."

In an email, U.S. Customs and Border Protection spokesman Daniel Hetlage referred a reporter to a Department of Homeland Security fact sheet, which says it is a "myth" that families asking for asylum legally at ports of entry are separated.

The sheet says DHS will separate in three circumstances: "1) when DHS is unable to determine the familial relationship, 2) when DHS determines that a child may be at risk with the parent or legal guardian, or 3) when the parent or legal guardian is referred for criminal prosecution."

In a federal court declaration, Marc W. Sanders, acting director of Homeland Security's Human Smuggling Cell, argued that releasing all families together can bolster human smuggling and increase illegal immigration.

"Once such a requirement is publicized it is likely to be a pull factor that contributes to further illicit migration to the United States," he wrote.

Ramos said she worries that despite President Trump's June 20 executive order to end family separations, border officials will continue separating families without due process by saying that a parent is a danger to the child or is not actually the parent.

"They were doing it before the zero-tolerance policy and they're going to keep doing it," she said. "They will say the parent presented a security risk without well-articulated reasons as to what that security risk was."

It is unclear how often families have been separated at ports of entry.

Customs and Border Protection spokesman Carlos Diaz said the agency did not have data on such separations. But if a family asks for asylum at a port of entry, "it is highly likely that the family will stay together through the process," Diaz added.

Diaz referred questions to the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Service. Officials there referred a reporter back to Customs and Border Protection.

Officials at the Department of Health and Human Services, the agency in charge of children who are separated from their parents, said only that the total number of children in its care is 11,800. This includes children who crossed the border without parents as well as those separated from their parents.

The ACLU case that prompted Sabraw's ruling described half a dozen cases of families separated at ports of entry, including Mirian's.

In several of those cases, parents said in sworn declarations they had documents showing their relationship to their children and were never told that officials believed they were a danger to their children.

In one case, a man from Kyrgyzstan who sought asylum in October at the port of entry in San Ysidro, Calif., with his 13-year-old son was told a few days later that they would be separated.

"All I can remember is how much my son and I were both crying as they took him away," the man wrote in a sworn declaration. "I do not recall anyone questioning whether I am really his biological father or whether I was a danger or abusive to him in any way. I even had my son's birth certificate proving I am his father."

In another case described in a lawsuit challenging family separations filed by 17 states and the District of Columbia, a mother who requested asylum at a port of entry in Laredo, Texas, with her 15-year-old son was told he would be taken to a shelter or "given to an American family for adoption."

The child is an American citizen.

In May, a Guatemalan mother approached the San Ysidro port of entry with her three sons — ages 2, 6 and 13 — saying she feared returning to her country because of her husband's community organizing work.

The family was taken to a detention center in Texas where they stayed together for two weeks before immigration officials took her children.

"Each minute that I am separated from my children is anguish," the woman wrote in a court declaration.

In November, Jose Demar Fuentes arrived at the San Ysidro port of entry with his 15-month-old son, Mateo, having fled gangs in El Salvador.

He had Mateo's original birth certificate, which listed him as the father, as well as his Salvadoran photo ID, said Olivia Caceres, Mateo's mother.

Still, after Customs and Border Protection transferred Fuentes and his son to Immigration and Customs Enforcement officials, the boy was taken to a facility in Texas.

"They said he couldn't prove he was the father, even though he had the original birth certificate," Caceres said.

ICE officials said they were “unable to positively confirm a father/son relationship during the custody determination interview.”

When she learned what had happened to her son, Caceres said, “I felt like a bucket of cold water had been dropped on me.”

She said she does not understand why her partner and their son were separated.

“If they don’t want us to break the law and we come legally to ask for help and they’re still separating us from our kids — it’s hard,” she said.

Almost two weeks passed before Caceres learned that her son was in a facility. Eventually, after proving she was his mother, she was allowed five-minute video calls with him twice a week.

During the calls, Mateo would stare at her face or bring her toys, trying to pass them through the phone.

His only words to her, the only words he knows, were “ma” and “pa.”

Despite what happened with her son, Caceres in late December followed Fuentes’ lead and turned herself in at a port of entry to ask for asylum, along with her son Andree, who was 4 years old at the time.

She was released with an ankle monitor and allowed to remain with the boy.

In Los Angeles, with the help of family, Caceres worked to be reunited with Mateo.

At one point, she was asked to take a DNA test, but her lawyer successfully fought against it because documentation had already been provided that she was Mateo’s mother.

Finally, on Feb. 7, she got a call letting her know that Mateo would arrive at the airport the next day.

Eighty-five days had passed since Mateo was separated from his father.

“You tell yourself, the small children aren’t going to suffer, but they do,” Caceres said. “He was traumatized and is still traumatized.”

The first week, when visitors arrived at their home, the boy would grab his mother’s legs and cry if they came near him.

On a recent weekday morning, Mateo woke up screaming, like he often does since their reunion. His mother hugged him tight to her chest, rubbing his back and whispering to him in Spanish: “Aquí está mamá.”

“Mom is here.”

Trump Admin Ran ‘Pilot Program’ For Separating Migrant Families In 2017

[NBC News](#), June 29, 2018

EL PASO, Texas — The government was separating migrant parents from their kids for months

prior to the official introduction of zero tolerance, running what a U.S. official called a “pilot program” for widespread prosecutions in Texas, but apparently did not create a clear system for parents to track or reunite with their kids.

Officials have said that at least 2,342 children were separated from their parents after being apprehended crossing the border unlawfully since May 5, when the Trump administration’s “zero tolerance” policy towards migrants went into effect.

But numbers provided to NBC News by the Department of Homeland Security show that another 1,768 were separated from their parents between October 2016 and February 2018, bringing the total number of separated kids to more than 4,100.

More than 1,000 children were separated between October 2016 and September 2017, and 703 were separated between October 2017 and February 2018, according to DHS.

It’s unclear how many of those 1,768 children were separated after President Donald Trump’s inauguration in January 2017. NBC repeatedly asked DHS for comprehensive data, but the agency declined to provide month-by-month figures, did not provide data prior to October 2016 and did not supply any numbers for March and April 2018.

A DHS official told NBC News that the practice of dividing parents and kids predates the Trump presidency. “DHS has continued a long-standing policy by the previous administration,” said the official, listing risk to the child and criminal prosecution of the parent as among the reasons for separation.

But the DHS official also confirmed to NBC that, from July 2017 to October 2017, the Trump administration ran what the official called a “pilot program” for zero tolerance in El Paso.

Court records and interviews with migrants show that during that period federal prosecutors began to criminally charge any adult who crossed the border unlawfully in the El Paso sector, which spans from New Mexico to West Texas. Parents arriving with young children were not exempt.

“This was happening in El Paso before it was news,” said Linda Rivas, executive director of Las Americas Immigrant Advocacy Center. “People didn’t believe it.”

Records and interviews indicate that mothers and fathers, most from Honduras, El Salvador and Guatemala, went to jail on charges of misdemeanor illegal entry or felony re-entry. Their children were reclassified as “unaccompanied” and sent into a network of shelters scattered across the country run by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, which

oversees the care of unaccompanied migrant children apprehended by the government.

Even those families who crossed the border hoping for asylum were caught up in the El Paso experiment. A mother named Jocelyn, whom Rivas represents, was apprehended crossing with her son last August near El Paso. Although Jocelyn said she sought asylum, she was prosecuted for illegal entry, court documents show. Her son was taken from her and sent to a shelter in Chicago. She told NBC News that nearly two months passed before she had any news of him, and she waited nine months before they were reunited.

"It's something that it's difficult to forget," Jocelyn said. "It will be with us for a very long time. We looked for protection and then this horrible thing happened."

Jocelyn and another migrant mother detained in San Diego became plaintiffs in a lawsuit filed by the ACLU against the federal government. This week, U.S. District Judge Dana Sabraw granted a preliminary injunction sought by the ACLU in the suit, mandating that all children affected by the "zero tolerance" policy be reunited with their parents within 30 days. He also ordered that within 10 days, parents be allowed a phone call with their children.

Prior administrations had avoided prosecuting parents who arrived with children, in particular mothers, because bringing criminal charges meant they would be jailed and their children sent to a shelter. But months before the pilot program launched in El Paso, Trump administration officials had indicated that breaking up parents and children could be an effective way to reduce the escalating numbers of families arriving at the border from the impoverished and violent countries in Central America's Northern Triangle.

The idea of separating migrant children from their mothers was discussed during the earliest days of the administration as a way to deter asylum-seekers, according to notes from an asylum officers' meeting.

At a town hall for Citizenship and Immigration Services asylum officers on Feb. 2, 2017, the agency's asylum chief, John Lafferty, told officers they might have to "hold mothers longer" and "hold children in HHR/ORR," an acronym for childrens' facilities run by HHS.

The next month, then-Homeland Security Secretary John Kelly told CNN he was considering separating families caught crossing the border "to deter more movement along this terribly dangerous network."

In a hearing before the Senate's Homeland Security Committee on April 5, 2017, Sen. Heidi Heitkamp, D.-N.D., asked Kelly if the agency planned to take children from mothers they apprehended crossing the border.

"Only if the situation at that point in time requires it," said Kelly. "Not routinely."

"If you thought the child was endangered, that's the only circumstance to which you would separate," Heitkamp said.

"Can't imagine doing it otherwise," Kelly replied.

But in July, as Kelly left his post at DHS to become President Donald Trump's chief of staff, the department launched its experiment in El Paso.

There was no official announcement. But late last summer, attorneys and advocates in this border city heard increasing numbers of migrants talk of their children being taken away — and having no idea where they were.

"It was just like a switch, you saw it happen overnight," said Jessie Miles, an immigration lawyer in El Paso and member of the Borderland Immigration Council, a coalition of immigration attorneys and advocates.

Attorneys with the Federal Public Defender's office in El Paso, which normally handles felonies, began to step in on misdemeanor illegal entry cases. Even on this part of the border, where immigration prosecutions have long been common, attorneys were stunned by how many shackled migrants began to shuffle into district court.

Typically, said Sandra Lewis, an El Paso federal public defender, the first question she'd get from her clients was about their own fate. Last fall, that changed.

"There was a shift from, 'What is going to happen to me,' to 'Where is my child?'" said Lewis.

Distress also grew among groups that care for unaccompanied children. Before last spring, staff at Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Services, a nonprofit that runs foster care programs for unaccompanied migrant children in federal custody, had seen the occasional separation, often when parents could not prove that the child they traveled with was their own.

"In May 2017, we started seeing cases of children who had been intentionally separated from people who were clearly their parents," said Danielle Bernard, director of communications at LIRS.

The numbers at LIRS started small, Bernard said. One case in May, another in June. In July, it spiked to seven. In August, it was 10, then 12 in November. In December, LIRS joined several other rights organizations to file a complaint with the DHS inspector general noting the "alarming" number of migrant families forcibly separated after crossing the border.

Back in El Paso, some began to wonder if the separations were a fluke, or a new policy.

On Oct. 24, advocates, attorneys and faith leaders in El Paso sat down with government officials for a

meeting about immigration. More than two dozen people gathered around a large table at a meeting coordinated by local Rep. Beto O'Rourke's office, according to five people who were present.

Representatives from CBP, Immigration and Customs Enforcement and DHS attended. Maureen Franco, the head of the Federal Public Defender's office in El Paso, told the group her office had received a striking number of family separation cases. What, she asked the federal officials, was the current policy involving the prosecution and separation of parents arriving with children?

A Border Patrol agent fielded the question, according to Jessie Miles, who was there on behalf of the Borderland Immigration Council. "His response was, the new policy is that we can separate children as long as they are 10 or over," she recalled. "To which Maureen responded, 'What do you mean? I have a client with a four-year-old.'"

"The whole room collectively gasped," said Miles.

The following afternoon, those who'd attended the meeting got an email from Lisa Donaldson, an attorney in the Office of Assistant Chief Counsel for CBP. She wanted to clarify comments "pertaining to separation of family units" at the meeting.

"The Border Patrol does not have a blanket policy requiring the separation of family units," she wrote in the email, which was reviewed by NBC. "Any increase in separated family units is due primarily to the increase in prosecutions of immigration related crimes."

In response to questions from NBC, a spokesman for CBP reiterated that position. Prior to zero tolerance, he said, CBP had no policy of separating families for reasons other than medical need, fraud or criminal cases, which could include criminal immigration violations.

Three days after the meeting, the El Paso pilot program ended, according to a DHS official. It was deemed a success. A bar graph reviewed by NBC noted that in October 2017, the last month of the program, the El Paso sector saw a 64 percent drop in apprehensions compared to the prior October.

The El Paso experiment would be used by ICE, CBP and Customs and Immigration Services to encourage DHS Secretary Kirstjen Nielsen to launch a zero-tolerance program across the entire Southwest border, according to an April memo obtained by the Washington Post. According to the Post, the memo attributed the 64 percent drop in apprehensions "to the prosecution of adults . . . for illegal entry," adding, "Of note, the numbers began rising again after the initiative was paused."

But at least one federal judge was troubled by consequences of the pilot program that he had seen in his courtroom.

On Nov. 1, six months before Attorney General Sessions officially implemented "zero tolerance," Magistrate Judge Miguel A. Torres expressed frustration from the bench in El Paso about the number of defendants who had been separated from their children and had no word of where they were.

In a hearing involving five such defendants, Judge Torres questioned the lack of information provided to parents.

"I've been troubled that by the time of their pleas they don't have this information," said Torres in audio obtained by NBC News. "It is an anxiety that looms large."

On June 8, more than six months later, another parent appeared before Torres.

The Guatemalan man had been separated from his 10-year-old daughter and charged with re-entering the U.S. illegally after being deported. Lewis, his federal public defender, was asking the judge to grant bail. She said the government had given her client no information about where his daughter was — not even the 1-800 number now given to parents searching for their children.

By that time, some 2,300 children had been separated from their parents since the implementation of zero tolerance in May. Torres was incredulous that parents continued to be locked in jail without any word of where their kids were.

"I cannot believe that the process isn't even explained," Judge Torres said. "[Y]ou don't get any kind of notification or any kind of explanation about what your process is. I don't understand that."

A week later, Judge Sabraw issued the injunction in Jocelyn's case, about ten months after she had been separated from her son in El Paso. His order echoed Torres's incredulity that the government had broken up families without any plan for putting them back together.

"The unfortunate reality is that under the present system migrant children are not accounted for with the same efficiency and accuracy as property," he wrote. "Certainly, that cannot satisfy the requirements of due process."

On June 20, Trump signed an executive order to "maintain family unity," effectively halting separations.

The government is now asking the Department of Defense to find space for 12,000 beds to detain families together along the border.

In that regard, El Paso may again be a pilot program — one of the bases being considered is Fort Bliss.

To advocates here, it was not an acceptable compromise.

"Family detention is not the solution," said Taylor Levy, the legal coordinator at Annunciation House, which houses and assists migrants in El Paso. "Children do not belong in detention. Babies do not belong in detention."

Concern Over Using US Military To Help Border Enforcement

By Robert Burns

[Associated Press](#), June 29, 2018

WASHINGTON (AP) — The Trump administration's request for the Pentagon to house migrants detained at the U.S. southern border and even help prosecute them is prompting concern about strains to the military.

Some call it an inappropriate mission.

"We shouldn't be militarizing border enforcement," Rep. Ro Khanna, a California Democrat, said in an interview.

Defense Secretary Jim Mattis, who has made it his top priority to improve the military's fitness for combat, argues that the Pentagon is nonetheless obliged to provide help with border enforcement.

In recent days Mattis has accepted requests by the departments of Homeland Security and Health and Human Services to provide temporary housing on Air Force and Army bases for potentially tens of thousands of detained migrant families and unaccompanied children. This is in line with historical precedents for military assistance, Mattis argued.

"We have housed refugees, we have housed people thrown out of their homes by earthquakes and hurricanes; we do whatever is in the best interest of the country," he recently told reporters. But he also has insisted that decisions about immigration policy and its security implications are not his to make. "I'm not going to chime in from the outside," he said.

The Pentagon says it received a Department of Homeland Security request to house up to 12,000 detained migrant family members, starting with shelters for 2,000 people to be available within 45 days. The initial shelters are likely to be at Fort Bliss in Texas, but subsequent tent cities could be at two other bases in border states.

The Pentagon has indicated Mattis will accept these requests, but no steps have been taken yet to move migrants onto the bases.

Mattis has emphasized that members of the military will not be directly involved in detaining or securing migrants. By law, the military is barred from performing domestic law enforcement functions such as

arresting people crossing the border, but it has sometimes provided support for border security, including monitoring surveillance imagery and repairing border fences.

Nonetheless, Mattis has been the target of pointed objections from senators critical of the Pentagon taking on a bigger role, including lending 21 military lawyers to the Justice Department to help prosecute immigration cases at the border.

"Clearly, the military needs more, not fewer, lawyers available for its critical military justice practice," Sens. Joni Ernst, R-Iowa, Kirsten Gillibrand, D-NY, and Patrick Leahy, D-Vt., wrote in a letter to Mattis last week. They pointed out the Pentagon already had said that military lawyers are too busy to expand the services of special victims counsel.

"Instead, we have now learned the services will be diverting these valuable resources to support a non-military mission," the senators wrote, adding that they are "deeply troubled" by what they consider a misuse of military personnel.

The Pentagon has agreed to set up tents – which it euphemistically calls "semi-separate, soft-sided camp facilities" – at Fort Bliss, if needed, for detained migrant families starting this summer. It has also agreed to make housing available at Goodfellow Air Force Base in Texas for up to 20,000 unaccompanied minors detained for illegally crossing the southern border.

These shelter operations, which could last for months, are to be run by DHS or HHS or their contractors, not the Pentagon, but defense officials say it is possible that the Pentagon will end up erecting the shelters.

This is not unprecedented. The Pentagon temporarily housed several thousand unaccompanied detained minors in 2014 at military bases. This year's problem has drawn wider attention and sharper criticism in part because of the administration's now-suspended practice of separating children from parents who are detained for illegally crossing the border.

"We certainly should not be using our nation's vital military bases for non-defense purposes," Rep. Raja Krishnamoorthi, an Illinois Democrat, said earlier this month in arguing that Congress should block funding for migrant detention facilities on military bases.

Even some Republicans who support Trump's crackdown on illegal immigration are unenthusiastic.

"I am not convinced at this point that housing them in our military installations is the best short-term answer, especially if it harms regular base operations, crowds our service members, and distracts from the mission of defense," Rep. Jodey Arrington, a Texas Republican, said in a statement. His district includes Dyess Air Force

Base, which is among bases under consideration for sheltering unaccompanied detained minors.

More broadly, Trump has urged the Pentagon to help pay for the border wall that he says is critically important to stemming the tide of illegal immigration. "Our Military is rich again," he wrote on Twitter in late March, adding that the Pentagon should pay for the wall because it would keep "enemy combatants" out of the country.

Copyright 2018 Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten, or redistributed.

Congress Leaves Town Without Voting On Fix To Stop Family Separations At Border

By Erin Kelly

[USA Today](#), June 29, 2018

WASHINGTON – Congress members have left town for a week-long Fourth of July recess without taking action to stop the continuing crisis of family separations at the U.S.-Mexico border.

House and Senate leaders had expressed hope that Congress could act quickly this week to pass a narrow bill that would allow migrant children to remain with their parents at detention centers beyond the current 20-day limit. At least five bills have been offered so far, but lawmakers have been unable to unite around any one of them.

Both chambers adjourned Thursday without a solution. They will return on July 9.

Members of both parties have condemned separating children from their parents as more than 2,000 babies, children and adolescents have been taken from their mothers and fathers as part of the Trump administration's "zero tolerance" immigration initiative announced in April. The policy has mostly affected families from Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador, who are fleeing widespread gang violence and some of the highest murder rates in the world.

Conservative Sen. Ted Cruz, R-Texas, recently summed up the reaction of most lawmakers when he said that "all Americans are rightly horrified by the images we are seeing on the news, children in tears pulled away from their mothers and fathers."

"This must stop. Now," Cruz said.

But stopping it has so far proved difficult.

Amid growing public outcry, Trump reversed his policy last week, ordering parents and children to stay together in detention centers after the parents are charged with crossing the border illegally.

However, a 2015 court ruling said that a 1997 legal agreement known as the Flores Settlement prohibits

immigration officials from keeping children in detention centers with adults for more than 20 days, even if they are with their parents. After those 20 days, children must be sent to separate youth detention facilities run by the Department of Health and Human Services.

That means that every day Congress fails to act, more families face separation.

Rep. Mark Meadows, R-N.C. has offered a bill – the Equal Protection of Unaccompanied Minors Act – that would keep parents and children together in detention centers run by the Department of Homeland Security.

The only exception: if parents or legal guardians are charged with a felony, they could not remain with their children. However, most of the adults crossing the border are charged with the misdemeanor crime of entering the U.S. illegally.

The measure was part of a much broader immigration reform bill that was defeated in the House on Wednesday, but Meadows and other supporters want lawmakers to vote on his legislation as a standalone bill.

"We need to better enforce our immigration laws, but we can do so while keeping parents and children together," Meadows said. "I believe my bill will help do that."

But Democrats say that keeping children in detention indefinitely with their parents is not an acceptable solution.

"Indefinite detention of children – they want to overturn the Flores case by making it longer," House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi, D-Calif., told reporters Thursday. "That is not going in a positive direction."

Rep. Jerrold Nadler, D-N.Y., has introduced a Democratic alternative – the Keep Families Together Act – that prohibits immigration officials from separating children from their parents, except in extraordinary circumstances.

It also limits the criminal prosecution of migrants who are seeking asylum in the U.S. The bill delays prosecution of adults for illegal entry or re-entry into the country, but does not specify where parents and children should stay while waiting to make their cases in court.

"The Keep Families Together Act does what this administration won't do, by including a variety of measures to prevent children from being separated from their parents," Nadler said. "I urge my Republican colleagues to stand on the right side of history by supporting this legislation."

Republicans overwhelmingly oppose the bill, charging that it is essentially a "catch and release" program that will let people go inside the U.S. with no guarantee that they will show up for their court hearings.

The best hope for a bipartisan compromise may be in the Senate, where the unlikely duo of Cruz and Sen. Dianne Feinstein, D-Calif., is working on a bill that would keep migrant families together without detaining them indefinitely or letting them go.

Among the possible options that Cruz and Feinstein have reportedly discussed: using ankle bracelets instead of detention to keep parents from fleeing while waiting with their children for court hearings.

"This is a manufactured crises, plain and simple," Feinstein tweeted this week. "Previous presidents have found ways to enforce our immigration laws without separating children from their parents. If the president won't protect children and keep families together, then Congress must."

Dem Slams Congress For Taking Recess Despite Migrant Families Still Being Separated

By Justin Wise

[The Hill](#), June 29, 2018

Rep. Ted Lieu (D-Calif.) on Friday chided Republicans for not taking up Democratic measures to reunite the thousands of migrant families that remain separated following President Trump's "zero tolerance" border enforcement policy.

"We are soon going to be heading off into our July Fourth recess," Lieu said on the House floor, referring to Congress's weeklong break.

"As we sit here today, there's still thousands of babies and kids ripped away from their parents by Trump's child separation policy that have not been reunited."

Lieu said it is "evil and shameful" that no Democratic bill has been brought to the floor to address the crisis.

"Have a nice vacation," he added.

Congress just left for another week of recess. Meanwhile, there's still thousands of children waiting to be reunited with their parents because of @realDonaldTrump's evil child separation policy.

To the Republican-controlled Congress: Have a nice vacation. #KeepFamiliesTogether
pic.twitter.com/IJHJeBRkc— Rep. Ted Lieu (@RepTedLieu) June 29, 2018

Lieu's statement comes more than a week after Trump signed an executive order to end his administration's practice of separating families at the U.S.-Mexico border.

The administration's zero tolerance policy resulted in more than 2,000 children being separated from their

parents while the adults face prosecution for illegally crossing the border.

It remains unclear how the administration intends to reunite every family that has been separated. Democratic lawmakers continue to press Trump Cabinet officials about the policy.

The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) announced last weekend that it knew the location of every child separated from their parents. But it did not offer any details about how it intends to reunify families.

Earlier this week, U.S. District Judge Dana Sabraw issued a ruling ordering the Trump administration to reunify all immigrant children under the age of 5 with their parents within two weeks, and all children age 5 and older within 30 days.

Trump's zero tolerance policy is also being challenged by a group of 18 Democratic attorneys general, who filed a lawsuit against the Trump administration over the policy.

Trump Threatens Cuts To Central America Aid. He'll Have To Go Through Granger First

By Andrea Drusch

[McClatchy](#), June 29, 2018

The last time Central American refugees arrived en masse at the U.S.-Mexico border, Republican Rep. Kay Granger drafted her party's plan to help those countries stop the violence causing families to flee.

Four years later — under an administration that's pledged to slash foreign aid and dramatically curb border crossings — the Texan is now at the center of a brewing fight over the future of that type of assistance.

Granger is a senior member of a small-but-powerful congressional panel responsible for doling out foreign aid. She's long championed that assistance as a crucial component of national security.

Though rarely a vocal critic of President Donald Trump's policies, so far Granger is bucking his administration on foreign aid.

"The catch we've got is a humanitarian response to these children, but we also have to understand the enormous threats... the violence in those countries that really brings parents and children across our border," said Granger, who GOP leaders appointed in 2014 to chair a task force on the issue.

Refugees from Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador are once again headed to the U.S. to escape horrific violence in their home countries, risking dangerous trips across multiple countries to get there.

The Department of Homeland Security reported 2,300 children had been separated from their families

when they reached that destination in the month of May. The surge in family separations was fueled in part by President Donald Trump's "zero-tolerance" policy to discourage border crossings.

The White House plans to solve the problem by asking Central American countries' governments to stop their own citizens from coming to the U.S. illegally — or risk losing aid money they receive from the U.S. for peacekeeping.

"When countries abuse us by sending people up — not their best — we're not going to give any more aid to those countries. Why the hell should we?" President Donald Trump said last week.

A group opposed to federally sanctioned separation of immigrant children from their parents picketed outside Representative Kay Granger's Fort Worth office Friday morning.

Granger has a different view. She's an expert on the crisis in Central America, and led trips to assess the situation first-hand in 2014.

She and her task force assembled and presented a list of solutions to GOP leaders in Washington, including taking a bigger role in stopping the violence in those countries.

"My recommendation was to go to the countries... and say, 'How can we help you with safety in your country?'" Granger told the Star-Telegram.

The formal pitch included increases to law enforcement operations in Central America to help crack down on drug cartels. It also called for additional judges to handle asylum cases in those countries.

"I'm going to try to, in this discussion, make people aware of what we did when I went to the border and saw that," Granger said Tuesday.

Money for that kind of humanitarian help will be on the line in the next federal budget, which lawmakers must assemble and agree to this fall. The new fiscal year begins October 1.

Trump campaigned on a promise to "put America first" — in part by cutting back on foreign aid.

Democrats are already gearing up to frame the growing border crisis as a referendum on those policies.

"Why are all these people trying to come across our borders? Because they live horrific lives," Sen. Tom Carper, D-Del. told reporters in a press conference Wednesday. "We are complicit in their misery."

The U.S. cut foreign aid to Central America roughly 20 percent over the past two fiscal years, from \$750 million in 2016 to \$615 million in 2018.

The White House wants to slash that spending much further.

Its budget— which functions as a suggestion to Congress's budget writers — proposed \$435 million for foreign aid to those countries in the 2019 fiscal year.

Granger's panel has so far bucked the White House's request for drastic cuts.

This month it approved \$595 million for Central America foreign aid in the 2019 fiscal year — well above Trump's request. It scrapped a \$20 million security and development grant from the previous year, which Democrats pushed to renew amid the ongoing crisis.

"I am willing to invest in stabilizing those countries, but you've got to prove you're getting something for your money," Sen. Lindsay Graham, R-S.C., who chairs the Senate panel in charge of that money, told the Star-Telegram.

The Senate panel this week allocated \$515.5 million for Central America aid.

The recommendations will be considered by the full House and Senate. If passed, as expected, House and Senate negotiators will craft a compromise budget, which must be approved by both chambers.

In a hearing with Senate budget writers this week, Secretary of State Mike Pompeo stressed that stabilizing the violence in Central America is critical to U.S. national security. He was skeptical, however, that more money was needed to accomplish that goal.

"We have devoted a great deal of U.S. resources to this," said Pompeo. "I don't think the region has been lacking for American financial support."

(Check out last week's Beyond the Bubble episode: The politics of family separation at the border)

Senate Democrats unveiled their own plan to help Central America on Wednesday— including restoring the region's aid to pre-Trump levels. They want to use that money to pursue a number of the solutions Granger's task force recommended in 2014.

Rep. Mario Diaz-Balart, R-Fla, who served on the task force with Granger, told the Star-Telegram Wednesday that those solutions alone hadn't proven effective in stopping the problems.

"I've been supportive of [foreign aid], but you cannot also minimize the fact that we have cartels... it doesn't matter how much aid you give," said Diaz-Balart, another member of panel that determines that funding.

In particular, Granger said bolstering asylum courts in those countries —something Democrats are proposing in their plan —didn't work.

"We did things that had worked in other countries, that had been successful... but the countries weren't getting any safer," she said.

Still Granger, a powerful voice in security and defense spending, is pushing her party not to give up on the problems causing families to flee.

"I'm a mother of three, a grandmother of five," said Granger. "My question was: What could be so bad that I would send my children with someone I'd never seen before, to a country I'd never been to?"

"I can't imagine how bad," she said.

NumbersUSA: For Longtime Backer Of Hard-line Immigration Measures, The Time Is Now

By Mike Woodel

[McClatchy](#), June 29, 2018

These are heady days for Roy Beck and NumbersUSA.

In the past year, the hardline immigration policies they've long championed have gained headlines and support. Numbers USA, which pushes for cuts in both legal and illegal immigration, reducing family-based visas and other restrictive measures, has gained exposure of its message from one of the brightest spots on the world stage.

"[T]o have a president that talks about immigration as much as this one does, it moves your issue much further to the front of the line," says Beck, who founded the group in 1997.

NumbersUSA's tough message puts it at odds with organizations funded by bigger names, including the Libre Initiative, which this spring launched a highly-publicized seven-figure ad campaign in support of Dreamers. The groups stand for opposing wings of the Republican party, with Libre representing the more moderate business lobby.

Libre has deep pockets: Two of its largest benefactors are billionaire industrialists Charles and David Koch.

But Beck's organization has been able to spread its message widely using something simple and cheap: Facebook's Share button. And in pure dollar terms, NumbersUSA has seen its revenue increase threefold from 2006 to 2016, allowing its advertising budget to stretch into the millions.

The group's social media strategy has met with stunning success. The NumbersUSA Facebook page's 7.2 million "likes" is nearly twice as many as the pages of both major parties combined. Their direct Facebook audience exceeds those of MSNBC, Ivanka Trump, Major League Baseball — and the main page for the Libre Initiative, which has only 861,000 likes.

"We can reach tens of millions of people by Facebook without spending any money," Beck said. "They distribute these things on their own."

That brings in donations, of course, though much of the funding for NumbersUSA comes via an estimated

1.5 million email subscribers, according to Beck. In FY 2017, the lobbying arm of the group had about \$1.2 million in donations and other revenue; a separate charitable arm of NumbersUSA brought in another \$7.5 million.

Though Facebook and email have been the organization's go-to ways to get the word out, for a current ad campaign, Beck has taken out pages in The Hill, Politico and National Review, among other outlets, and aired ads on CNN and Fox News.

NumbersUSA favored the House immigration bill that went down to defeat on June 21; Virginia Republican Bob Goodlatte's bill contained a couple of the group's top priorities, including mandated use of the E-verify system by employers and the end of family-based visas.

The bill that failed on June 27, by contrast, was scorned by the group as an "amnesty" bill.

And NumbersUSA wants lawmakers to know it is watching. While it doesn't explicitly endorse individual House and Senate candidates, it has others ways of wielding political influence: Like some other advocacy groups, it distributes election guides, assigning members of Congress letter grades for their individual voting records on immigration.

In the current Congress, 97 percent of Democrats in the House and Senate have an "F" or "F-minus."

Given the positions it takes on an issue that's historically sensitive, NumbersUSA was controversial from the get-go. It hasn't been formally labeled a hate group by the Southern Poverty Law Center, but the center has denounced it for years, in no small part due to the group's connections to John Tanton. Tanton, a retired Michigan ophthalmologist, was named the "racist architect of the modern anti-immigrant movement" by the SPLC, which also called his quarterly journal, The Social Contract, the work of "race-baiting" white nationalists.

Beck was Washington editor of the journal.

Wendy Feliz, communications director of the American Immigration Council, which advocates for undocumented immigrants, maintains that NumbersUSA and other Tanton-connected groups use fear to sell their ideology.

"Fear is a powerful motivator," Feliz said, "and I do think they worked very hard to make [immigration] a partisan issue. And they've raised money by making it a partisan issue and by inciting a sense of fear in the public."

Without fail, the organization's revenue spikes whenever Congress feuds about immigration. IRS filings gathered by ProPublica show that, after totaling less than \$300,000 in FY 2006, contributions to NumbersUSA's lobbying arm quadrupled to \$1.2 million

when the Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act of 2007 was introduced.

The bill, which would have provided a path to citizenship for 12 million undocumented immigrants, failed in the Senate. NumbersUSA was profiled in The New York Times a month later and contributions to that part of the organization have dipped below \$1 million only once in the decade since.

A second arm of the group, the NumbersUSA Education and Research Foundation (ERF), also had slim funding until close to the end of the last decade. Contributions doubled to \$8 million in the run-up to the 2008 election and neared \$10 million during the 2013 immigration debate.

Neither part of the organization is required to release the names of its individual or corporate donors, but some foundations that give to ERF are known. It relies on sizable grants from the Pittsburgh-based Colcom Foundation, founded in the mid-1990s by Cordelia Scaife May, an heir to the Mellon banking fortune. May's primary concerns were "the major causes and consequences of overpopulation and its impact on environmental sustainability," according to Colcom's website.

Beck says his organization's hotly-debated 1996 "gumball" video — in which Beck used gumballs to illustrate the scale of immigration by the world's poor to the U.S. — and Beck's book from the same year, "The Case Against Immigration," caught May's attention.

May died in 2005, but the pipeline remains open: Colcom has given ERF more than \$30 million since then. Colcom's grant of \$6.78 million to ERF in FY 2016 accounted for almost a quarter of Colcom's grants and more than half of ERF's revenue that year, its highest-grossing on record.

Colcom vice president of philanthropy John Rohe did not respond to requests for comment.

Not long before the Libre Initiative's recent campaign started up, NumbersUSA also conceded some support for Dreamers, in Goodlatte's Securing America's Future Act, which it supported because of tough measures the bill, which was voted down, also contained. It was the first time the organization has endorsed what some consider an "amnesty" proposal.

That's about where similarities between the positions of the two groups stop. And NumbersUSA's more draconian vision — which favors restricting birthright citizenship and lowering legal migration limits to 500,000 per year, can be a tough sell: Witness the public outcry that led the Trump administration to reverse course on separating families who cross the southern border seeking asylum.

But that doesn't deter Beck, especially not now, with the wind at his back.

"In the end, groups like ours which are public interest groups have the advantage of having lots of members," says Beck. "You leverage that kind of goodwill among the public, that really magnifies every dollar that's spent."

And those dollars keep rolling in. "The more that Congress is dealing with immigration, the higher the funding," Beck says.

We May Be Able To Help Reunite Immigrant Children With Parents, Nonprofit Says

By Dianne Solis

[Dallas Morning News](#), June 29, 2018

A nonprofit has created a database that could help more than 2,000 immigrant children be swiftly reconnected with their parents even as lawyers and advocates become increasingly frustrated about not knowing where many of the children are.

The database will allow parents and legal representatives who are trying to locate separated children to submit inquiries by phone and email. From there, the Vera Institute of Justice, a New York-based nonprofit, and its partners hope to connect the families with attorneys to work on the immigrants' legal cases.

Vera has a federal legal services contract and distributes funds to other agencies around the nation to perform legal orientation in shelters for unaccompanied immigrant children, including those taken from their parents as part of Trump's immigration enforcement effort.

"Reuniting the families fractured by these policies is a critical first step — but it is not enough," Nick Turner, the president of Vera, said in a news release. "The solution to the humanitarian crisis this administration created can't be indefinite family detention, and it certainly can't be to force families to desperately accept deportation in order to stay together. That's not what justice looks like, and these families deserve more."

The government has responded slowly to plans to reunite families after President Trump signed an executive order June 20 declaring that no more immigrant children crossing the border should be separated from their parents. Vera has created a database tool with the names of immigrant children who recently were placed in about 100 shelters across the nation under the zero-tolerance immigration policies of President Donald Trump. Vera's partners provide services at the shelters.

At the border, doctors, advocates worry medical care for immigrants is lacking

Staff at the institute realized they collect data on those children who get the services, and their detective work may prove crucial to lawyers working to reunite broken families because U.S. government agencies have fumbled in efforts to reconnect frantic parents with children taken from them. Vera and the D.C.-based nonprofit New America, along with other legal services groups, call the database tool the Immigrant Connection Project, or ICON.

"While we can't begin to undo the trauma these families have experienced, we must continue our work to ensure that they are served, rather than harmed, by our justice system," Turner said.

Immigrant children fleeing Central America arrive on government buses at the Central Station bus terminal in downtown McAllen on Sunday, June 24, after being processed by the U.S. Border Patrol. From there the families were gathered up and walked a few blocks away to the Catholic Charities of the Rio Grande Valley. There they can get cleaned up, fed and receive help getting transportation to their future destinations. (Tom Fox/The Dallas Morning News)

(Tom Fox/Staff Photographer)

In April, Attorney General Jeff Sessions announced the zero-tolerance policy at the border. In May, Sessions made clear that the policy would include the systematic separation of immigrant parents who are charged with a crime after crossing the Mexico border with their children. The policy ignited outrage around the nation even as federal authorities claimed it was an insurmountable byproduct of Trump's decision to prosecute every adult immigrant who crosses the border in an unauthorized way in the federal criminal courts.

When a parent is criminally charged, his or her children are separated from them because minors cannot be jailed. Gut-wrenching separations were detailed by lawyers or unveiled through secretly recorded audio of crying children screaming for parents or begging officials to be reunited with a relative. In McAllen and Brownsville, fathers could be heard in open court asking magistrate judges for their children if they were deported.

Trump's executive order halting the separations was signed days after he said only Congressional legislation could do that. But of at least 2,500 children taken from parents, as of last week, only about 500 children had been reunited with their parents, the federal government said.

After Homeland Security insisted it had a plan to reunite the children last Saturday night, it quickly became apparent from attorneys and others that families

were increasingly frantic. Government hotlines set up to reunite parents weren't working, or provided callers with very little information. Some children had been scattered around the nation, while parents were still in the Rio Grande Valley.

In some cases, parents who were separated from their children when they were criminally prosecuted with misdemeanors for crossing the border unlawfully ended up getting light sentences or are released on time served only to learn that they were being deported without the child they arrived with.

Why don't Mexicans just apply for citizenship?

This past week in McAllen, an attorney for the Texas Civil Rights Project detailed the deportation of a father to Guatemala, whose son is still believed to be in the U.S. somewhere in a shelter. Other, similar cases have been reported.

"It is absolutely our concern that this has happened on a wider scale and it will continue to happen," said Natalia Cornelio of the civil rights firm on Tuesday morning.

Attorneys and advocates have become increasingly frustrated by the fact that more of the children have not been reunited with their parents. At the Port Isabel detention facility in Los Fresnos, where the government said many would be reunited, little actual activity has been reported.

On Tuesday night, federal judge Dana M. Sabraw in California ordered the federal government to reunite parents with their children within 30 days. If the children were under 5 years of age, the judge ordered reunification in 14 days. Sabraw, an appointee of Republican President George W. Bush, took aim at the government for not having a reunification plan to "address a chaotic circumstance of the government's own making."

Sabraw also noted that some of the border-crossers criminally charged with unlawful entry were actually asylum-seekers, who are legally allowed to seek shelter in the U.S.

"We are country of laws, and of compassion," Sabraw wrote. "We have plainly stated our intent to treat refugees with an ordered process..."

On Friday, the Vera institute, which has held the legal services contract through the Office of Refugee Resettlement of the Health and Human Services Department for 13 years, announced that it had collected data on the identities of many of the children. That data should allow them to be rematched with their parents.

Vera's contract lets it manage services for legal help for children in the federal shelters who are entitled to legal representation once they are considered unaccompanied minors.

Organizations receiving the funds managed by Vera, such as San Antonio-based Refugee and Immigrant Center for Education and Legal Services, or RAICES, fan out into the shelters to educate minors on their rights. More than 30 organizations have Vera Institute subcontracts.

Asylum seekers reportedly denied entry at border as Trump tightens 'zero tolerance' immigration policies

RAICES, which has a Dallas office, posted this week on social media that it had built a database of about 450 parents so that legal service providers could link them to separated kids. "The youngest: 2 months old," read the RAICES post.

It was followed by the hashtags #AbolishICE and #FamiliesBelongTogether. ICE handles a portion of the nation's deportations.

More than \$20 million has been raised for RAICES, through a social media campaign that began when family separations began to take place with force.

Information can be found on the ICON project can be found on the Vera's website. Attorneys or parents seeking children should email familyconnect@vera.org or call 800-845-8372.

"Beyond the deep psychological trauma suffered by children who are separated from their families, we know that contact with parents is critical to conducting a proper assessment of the legal options for separated children," said Anne Marie Mulcahy, director of Vera's program for unaccompanied children.

Impact of Donald Trump's immigration crackdown and zero-tolerance at the border

Sponsors Of Migrant Children Face Steep Transport Fees And Red Tape

By Miriam Jordan

[New York Times](#), July 1, 2018

LOS ANGELES — Marlon Parada, a construction worker in Los Angeles, already was worried when he got an urgent call from his cousin in Honduras, asking if he would agree to take in the cousin's 14-year-old daughter. She'd been taken from her mother while attempting to cross the border and detained in Houston, he said. She couldn't be released unless a family member agreed to take her in.

Mr. Parada, an immigrant himself who is supporting his wife and three daughters on \$3,000 a month, wondered how he could afford to take on another responsibility. Then he learned that he would have to pay \$1,800 to fly Anyi and an escort from Houston to Los Angeles.

"It caught me by surprise when they demanded all that money. I asked them to just put her on a bus, but

they wouldn't," said Mr. Parada, who scrambled to amass the cash from friends and wired it to the operator of the migrant shelter where Anyi was being held.

But that was only one of the hurdles he would have to surmount to take custody of the girl. Families hoping to win release for the thousands of migrant children being held by federal immigration authorities are finding they have to navigate an exhausting, intimidating — and sometimes expensive — thicket of requirements before the youngsters can be released.

Candidates for sponsorship must produce a plethora of documents to prove they are legitimate relatives and financially capable sponsors, including rent receipts, utility bills and proof of income. Home visits are increasingly common as part of the process. And once those conditions are met, many families must pay hundreds or even thousands of dollars in airfare to bring the children home.

"The government is creating impossible barriers and penalizing poverty," said Neha Desai, director of immigration at the National Center for Youth Law in Oakland.

An estimated 11,000 children and teenagers apprehended after crossing the border are currently housed in up to 100 government-contracted facilities across the country. Their numbers have grown in recent weeks as the Trump administration has imposed a "zero-tolerance" policy on border enforcement, purporting to end the strategy of "catch and release" under which migrants were often allowed to go free pending hearings in the immigration courts.

Under the most controversial part of the new strategy, more than 2,300 children were separated from their families and placed in shelters occupied mainly by young people who had made their way across the border alone. President Trump relented last week and ordered that families be kept together whenever possible, but authorities now are struggling to process the estimated 2,000 separated children still remaining in federal facilities.

The Office of Refugee Resettlement, which has official custody of migrant children under detention and establishes conditions for releasing them, has made it clear that the requirements are intended to make sure children are not released to traffickers, and will be well cared for in their new homes.

In testimony to the Senate in late April, Steven Wagner, the acting assistant secretary of health and human services, said that in assessing a sponsor's suitability, the agency "evaluates the sponsor's ability to provide for the child's physical and mental well-being, but also the sponsor's ability to ensure the child's presence at future immigration proceedings."

The requirement for sponsors to pay transportation costs has long been part of the agency's procedures and was not initiated by the Trump administration, officials said.

Immigrant advocates say that migrant families often have spent their entire savings to reach the United States border, and their relatives in the United States may not have much money, either.

One potential sponsor was rejected recently because authorities decided she could not afford the child's medication, Ms. Desai said. A mother of two was told that her house was not large enough to accommodate a third child. Another was told that she had to move to a better neighborhood if she wanted to be approved.

A new condition requires that all adults in the household where a migrant child will reside submit fingerprints to Immigration and Customs Enforcement. Such a requirement has intimidated many undocumented immigrants, who represent the majority of sponsors but fear being targeted for deportation themselves.

"Previously, people readily identified themselves" to sponsor a child, said Lisa Rivera, managing attorney at the New York Legal Assistance Group. But, she added, "This is not an environment where someone is going to call and say, 'I want to take my child, niece or nephew.' They have to find someone who has legal status."

A Guatemalan immigrant in New York dreaded submitting her fingerprints in order to sponsor two teenage family members being detained at a shelter in Texas, but felt she had no choice.

"I wouldn't even be able to ask someone else to be their sponsor. All my family and friends are undocumented and afraid," said the woman, who declined to be identified by name because she fears attracting the attention of authorities.

The last straw: She had to borrow money to pay the \$2,500 to fly them earlier this year from Texas to New York, where she lives.

"It was a nearly impossible amount for a single mother earning \$200 a week," said Crystal Fleming, the lawyer at the Legal Assistance Group representing the teenagers.

Brenda, a Salvadoran migrant who was separated from her 7-year-old son Kevin at the border on May 27, was charged \$576.20 to cover the boy's airfare from Miami to Virginia. His escort collected the money order at Washington Dulles airport on Friday upon handing over the child to his mother.

"I was shocked that they had to pay for the boy's airfare," said Astrid Lockwood, the lawyer for the mother

and child, who had been held at a shelter in Florida. Ms. Lockwood said that in a decade of practicing immigration law she had never seen this requirement, but noted that she also had not encountered children placed in facilities thousands of miles from their ultimate destination, as has occurred in recent weeks.

Under the policy manual of the Office of Refugee Resettlement, sponsors are responsible for paying transportation costs for both the child and any escort, along with fees charged by airlines for handling transport of unaccompanied minors.

The payment requirement was also in place during the Obama administration, though in 2016, when a surge of families crossing the border created large populations in migrant shelters, it was waived. Shelter operators were instructed to pay for transportation to enable families to reunite more quickly, and were then reimbursed by the government, said Bob Carey, who led the refugee resettlement office during the Obama administration.

The thinking was, "It's counterintuitive to keep a child in care," he said.

"The human cost incurred aside," he added, "the financial cost for the government is significant. One day of care could cover transportation costs."

Each day that a child remains in a facility costs the government upwards of \$600 a day, and costs can rise to as much as \$1,000 daily if a provider has to absorb new children on short notice, Mr. Carey said.

On a case-by-case basis, immigrant families sometimes get help with transport costs. Nonprofits may help cover the airfare. Sometimes lawyers and other advocates convince a child's case manager to reduce the travel fee or waive it altogether due to hardship.

A shelter in South Texas asked a Salvadoran woman for \$4,000 to fly her niece, 12, and nephew, 10, with an escort to California. They were there a month, until she convinced them that she could not pay, said Fred Morris, president of the San Fernando Valley Refugee Children Center, a nonprofit that helped her locate the children. The siblings arrived in Los Angeles on Saturday.

It took Oscar Garcia of Anaheim, Calif., a month to complete the paperwork to sponsor his nephew, Diego, 11, who was held at a facility in southern Texas after crossing the border from El Salvador. As part of the process, Mr. Garcia, a father of three who does remodeling work on homes, sent pictures of his two-bedroom house to the case manager via Whatsapp. He also submitted fingerprints for a background check.

"When everything was done, they told me it would cost \$1,400 to bring the boy here," he recalled. He borrowed \$900 from his brother-in-law and depleted his

\$500 in savings to afford tickets for the boy and an escort. The child landed in Los Angeles in May.

"I didn't want to leave him stuck there," said Mr. Garcia.

In the case of the Parada family in Los Angeles, Mr. Parada said both Anyi and her mother had been through a lot in their journey and subsequent detention, and he knew it was important to get the girl out of the shelter as quickly as he could.

Mother and daughter had traveled over land by bus and car to reach the southwest border in early May. After wading through the Rio Grande to reach Texas, they were promptly intercepted by the Border Patrol, Anyi told her family. They were then separated: Anyi's mother was transferred to a detention center in Seattle; the girl was transported to Casa Quetzal, a shelter for minors in Houston that is operated by Southwest Key, one of the country's largest shelter operators for minors.

The separation prompted Anyi's father in Honduras to reach out to his cousin in California.

After compiling dozens of documents and submitting his fingerprints for a background check, Mr. Parada learned that he would have to pay the \$1,800 in airfare: one way for the girl, round trip for her escort.

"They notified me a day before her release," he said. "I had no choice."

Collapse

SEE MY OPTIONS

Salvadoran Mother Is Reunited With Her Son After Separation

[WTOP-FM Washington](#), June 30, 2018

(WASHINGTON) — Arriving nearly one minute before her 7-year-old son stepped into the terminal at Dulles International Airport outside Washington, D.C., Brenda rushed to embrace Kevin, after having been apart for a month and four days, a separation long enough for emotions to run high for this family reunification.

"I couldn't take one more minute without being able to be here with him," said Brenda, who asked that her last name not be used.

Her attorney, Astrid Lockwood, interpreted for her.

"Today I feel like my heart was returned to me," Brenda said.

However, Brenda faced a number of challenges before she could be reunited with her son.

Towards the end of May, Brenda fled from Santa Tecla, El Salvador, to the U.S.-Mexico border with Kevin after she says she was threatened by two rival gangs in the area. When the pair arrived at the southwest border

of Arizona, Brenda said she asked for asylum and was immediately apprehended by U.S. officials.

Officials soon separated Brenda from her son and each was sent to a different facility.

Kevin was placed in a shelter facility in Miami for young children, while Brenda was sent to three different facilities. She was even mistakenly sent to an all-male facility in Arizona, Lockwood said.

However, Immigration and Customs Enforcement officials said the facility houses both men and women. It is still unclear exactly where Brenda was detained and under what conditions.

During their time apart, Brenda and Kevin had difficulty communicating, Lockwood said.

"I couldn't sleep. I couldn't eat. All I could think about was where he was, how he was," Brenda said.

On June 21, a federal immigration judge authorized Brenda to be released on an immigration bond, an ICE spokesperson told ABC News. Five days later, Brenda was released from ICE custody after posting bond.

Her case is pending in the immigration courts, according to ICE.

Brenda is one of many undocumented immigrants who have been separated from their children at the border after seeking asylum in the U.S., a result of the Trump administration's "zero-tolerance" immigration policy.

After the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) confirmed that nearly 2,300 children were separated from their families, a wave of immigrant advocacy groups and social justice leaders mobilized support from thousands. Facing an overwhelming backlash, President Trump signed an executive order last week to put an end to the policy.

However, a spokesman for the American Civil Liberties Union remained unconvinced, saying: "The devil is in the details."

"This crisis will not abate until each and every single child is reunited with his or her parent," said Anthony D. Romero, the group's executive director.

The ACLU was one of the first groups to take legal action against the Trump administration in *Ms. L v. ICE* earlier this year, after a mother from the Congo seeking asylum and her 7-year-old daughter were separated.

They were reunited in March.

On Tuesday, a federal judge rejected the government's request to dismiss the ACLU's case and ruled the challenge can proceed after the group filed for class certification.

Moreover, the group has collected more than 226,000 signatures for a petition to end family separation and numerous donations from supporters.

On Friday evening, the Department of Justice (DOJ) said families will be detained together during immigration proceedings.

"To comply with the Ms. L injunction barring parents in DHS custody from being separated from their children, the Government will not separate families but detain families together during the pendency of immigration proceedings when they are apprehended at or between ports of entry," the DOJ said in a statement.

Lockwood told ABC News that Brenda's next steps in this process are to complete a "motion of change of venue" to the Baltimore court. If the motion is granted, their cases can be consolidated and heard together where they will continue to fight for their asylum, said Lockwood.

"I feel strong, I feel positive now, now that I have I have my child," Brenda said. "I know that it's not going to be easy to fight the asylum case but I have faith in God that everything will turn out alright."

A Migrant Mother Had To Pay \$576.20 To Be Reunited With Her 7-Year-Old Son

By Kanyakrit Vongkiatkajorn
[Mother Jones](#), July 1, 2018

As the Trump administration continues to face criticism over its vague plans for reuniting separated families, there's yet another obstacle confronting those who are trying to free children from government custody. The relatives of these kids have to pay steep fees, including the cost of airfare and a child escort, in order to secure their release.

As the New York Times reports, these fees, coupled with documentation requirements that include proof of income and rent receipts, can make it extremely difficult for sponsors to claim custody of the children. The Office of Refugee Resettlement, the government agency responsible for migrant children who have been apprehended by border patrol agents, says that the requirements help ensure the children are not being released to traffickers and are placed in suitable homes. Sponsors must prove that they are related to the child and financially able to support them.

Many of these policies were in place before Donald Trump's presidency, and they apply broadly to unaccompanied minor immigrants—not just to those who were separated from their parents under Trump's controversial "zero tolerance" policy. But according to the Times, the Obama administration waived the travel fees in 2016 when a large number migrant families crossing the border overwhelmed US facilities.

Under Trump, however, families of migrant children have been charged large sums of money. In one

instance, a Los Angeles construction worker had to pay \$1,800 to cover airfare for his cousin's 14-year-old daughter—who'd been separated from her mother by immigration officials—and an escort. "They notified me a day before her release," the man said. "I had no choice."

In another case, a Salvadoran migrant was charged nearly \$600 for her own son's airfare when she was reunited with him:

Brenda, a Salvadoran migrant who was separated from her 7-year-old son Kevin at the border on May 27, was charged \$576.20 to cover the boy's airfare from Miami to Virginia. His escort collected the money order at Washington Dulles airport on Friday upon handing over the child to his mother.

"The government is creating impossible barriers and penalizing poverty," Neha Desai, director of immigration at the National Center for Youth Law, told the Times.

CNN Aims Reunification Of Illegal Alien Family But Cut Away From Trump Honoring Angel Families

By Benny Johnson
[Daily Caller](#), June 29, 2018

CNN sent a reporter to Dulles airport in Virginia Friday afternoon in order to cover live the reunification of an illegal immigrant mother and her son. The footage showed a mother greeting her son, whom she was separated from when she illegally crossed into America in May.

According to CNN, the woman is from El Salvador and has been waiting for her 7-year-old son to be returned to her after a month of separation because she came into the country illegally.

As the mother spoke with the shellshocked little boy, reporters swarmed and cameras rolled.

CNN's reporter said, "[Brenda] and her son had crossed the border illegally, according to what her legal representation has told us. And she had her attorneys believe they were separated so that Brenda could face these criminal charges under President Trump's zero-tolerance policy — these charges for illegal entry. Her attorneys telling me that never happened. But they say that the damage was done when the child was taken away from her mother."

The CNN anchor called it "remarkable to see."

CNN stayed on the shot of the reunification until the commercial break.

Last Friday, however, when president Trump brought parents who had their children killed by illegal immigrants to the White House to tell their stories, CNN

refused to air the entire event, opting to instead cut to a panel.

The parents told heart-wrenching emotional stories about being separated from their children “permanently” and criticized how no one in media covered their stories.

Father Steve Ronnebeck lost his 21-year-old son Grant Ronnebeck to an illegal alien who shot him for a pack of cigarettes. Ronnebeck said “You don’t hear these stories, and some of our media won’t talk to you about it... I wish some of our media had the same integrity as our president, our vice president, Director [of ICE] Homan, all of you in law enforcement.”

Alex Wong/Getty Images

CNN cut away from the event soon after as host Brooke Baldwin asked why the parents were complaining about the news media before CNN went live to a Texas detention facility with a chyron that read, “Thousands of kids in limbo as Trump’s order sparks confusion.”

Despite Trump, American Support For Legal Immigration Is Growing

By Riley Griffin

[Bloomberg News](#), June 29, 2018

President Donald Trump’s ban on travelers from five Muslim-majority countries and his crackdown on the southern border make it easy to overlook broader acceptance among Americans for legal immigration.

About one in three Americans supports increasing legal immigration to the United States, according to a Pew Research Center study released Thursday. Thirty-eight percent said legal immigration should be kept at its current level, while 24 percent said that it should be decreased.

The study highlights a dramatic shift in public sentiment toward legal immigrants since 2001, when the September 11 attacks spurred distrust of immigrant communities among some. Since then, the share of Americans who favor increased legal immigration to the United States has risen from 10 percent to 32 percent. The share who support a decrease in legal immigration has plummeted from 53 percent to 24 percent.

The Pew survey, conducted in June using a national sample of 2,002 adults, found that the changing views of legal immigration have been driven by liberals. The number of Democrats and progressive independents who believe legal immigration should increase doubled from 20 to 40 percent since 2006.

Republican views have also shifted. The share of Republicans who believe legal immigration to the United States should be decreased fell from 43 to 33 percent.

Still, twice as many Republicans as Democrats support cutting back on legal immigration.

“The national conversation has changed a great deal on this issue over the last 15 to 20 years,” Carroll Doherty, director of political research at Pew, told Bloomberg. “There’s a much bigger partisan gap on this issue than there was in the mid-2000s. Republicans and Democrats used to feel pretty similarly about this issue. But in the last 10 years, Democrats have moved significantly toward supporting legal immigration.”

The United States has more immigrants than any other country in the world, 76 percent of whom are in the country legally. But only 45 percent of Americans were aware that the vast majority of immigrants have legal documentation, the study found.

Nearly seven in 10 Americans feel sympathy toward undocumented immigrants living in the United States. Eighty-six percent of Democrats and 48 percent of Republicans said they feel sympathetic. These numbers are little changed since 2014, when a surge of unaccompanied minors from Central America attempted to cross the border.

With Ban Upheld, Travel Industry Urges A Welcome For Tourists

By Elaine Glusac

[New York Times](#), June 29, 2018

Travel to the United States has declined after President Trump’s initial executive order. Now, after a Supreme Court ruling, companies are emphasizing their commitment to hospitality.

The travel industry is hoping to turn the page on a bad public relations chapter in the wake of the Supreme Court decision upholding the travel ban on five Muslim-majority nations as well as North Korea and some travelers from Venezuela.

“The most important thing is the administration has got to change its rhetoric to welcoming legitimate travelers from around the world because the noise has been so loud around this issue that we’ve been hurt in inbound international travel,” said Roger Dow, the president and chief executive officer of the U.S. Travel Association, an industry trade group with members that include hotels, theme parks and airports.

International travel in the United States fell during the earliest days of the Trump administration when the initial travel ban was issued by executive order in January 2017.

According to preliminary figures released in March by the National Travel & Tourism Office at the Department of Commerce, international visitors to the United States in 2017 fell by 3.8 percent to 54.9 million.

The office has not released 2018 figures because of what it says is an undercount of the previous two years, which it says it is working to correct.

Still, other measures confirmed the decline in international travel. In a preliminary release of figures by the United Nations World Trade Organization, international tourism grew globally by 7 percent in 2017, but grew only by 3 percent in North America. It noted that losses in the United States were offset by gains in Canada and Mexico.

The airfare prediction app Hopper found that flight searches to the United States from outside of the country have fallen 12 percent since the 2016 presidential election.

Mr. Dow of the U.S. Travel Association estimated the loss of foreign travelers at less than 2 percent, which represents about \$32 billion in spending.

The travel ban isn't the only reason inbound international tourism has taken a hit in the United States, industry analysts say. Contributing factors include the strength of the dollar, which made travel to the United States more expensive, and the rise of low-cost airlines within Europe in particular that made travel there more attractive, they say.

Inbound travel spending is considered an export and at \$245 billion, according to the U.S. Travel Association, it represents the second largest industry export after transportation equipment, such as airplanes. Subtracting the \$161 billion Americans spend traveling abroad, the country currently has a \$84 billion trade surplus in travel.

According to the Commerce Department's tourism office, the Middle East accounted for 3.5 percent of inbound international tourism in 2016, or about 1.3 million, and none of the countries covered by the ban with the exception of Venezuela is among the top 20 tourism markets coming to the United States. (The Muslim-majority countries are Syria, Iran, Yemen, Libya and Somalia.)

The travel ban that was upheld by the court on June 26 in effect since December.

With renewed attention to it, travel companies are pivoting from expressions of concern to those of welcome aimed at reassuring international travelers across the spectrum of nationality and religion.

"While inbound travel into the United States is down, we are optimistic that this trend can and will turnaround," wrote Leigh Barnes, the regional director for North America at Intrepid Travel, which offers tours around the world.

"The U.S. government has been the source of a lot negative media attention this year, but it is the responsibility of the travel industry to continue to stand

for open borders, inclusivity and the celebration of diversity, despite what is happening in the political world," Mr. Barnes wrote.

The company would not say how much its United States business is down, but last September it said tours within the country were off by 24 percent compared to the previous year.

Other industry leaders acknowledged the need for border security while maintaining their commitment to hospitality.

In a statement, Hilton Hotels said: "As a company that hires employees and welcomes guests from all over the world, we recognize the need to balance safety and security with the unwavering hospitality that is at the core of our industry. We are talking to the Administration, Congress, and the broader travel community with the goal of developing smart policies that strike the right balance between encouraging hospitality and enhancing national security."

Others were more outspoken. The shared accommodations company Airbnb, which operates in over 191 countries, said its business had not been affected by the tumult, neither at home nor abroad, and did not expect the Supreme Court decision to impact its future business. Still, the company, which has criticized the administration, most famously in a Super Bowl ad in 2017 with the theme "we all belong" depicting a diverse group of people, has been speaking out against the Supreme Court decision.

"Airbnb and travel at large is actually designed to encourage people to spend time with people with different backgrounds," said Chris Lehane, the global head of policy for the company. "That's why we think this decision is so profoundly wrong."

Collapse

SEE MY OPTIONS

What It Costs To Be Smuggled Across The U.S. Border

By Nicholas Kulish

[New York Times](#), June 30, 2018

Bribes and shakedowns. Days in hideaways without food. For many fleeing violence in Central America, this is what thousands of dollars gets them on the journey to the United States.

Bribes and shakedowns. Days in hideaways without food. For many fleeing violence in Central America, this is what thousands of dollars gets them on the journey to the United States.

MATAMOROS, Mexico — Shortly before dawn one Sunday last August, a driver in an S.U.V. picked up Christopher Cruz at a stash house in this border city

near the Gulf of Mexico. The 22-year-old from El Salvador was glad to leave the one-story building, where smugglers kept bundles of cocaine and marijuana alongside their human cargo, but he was anxious about what lay ahead.

The driver deposited Mr. Cruz at an illegal crossing point on the edge of the Rio Grande. A smuggler took a smartphone photograph to confirm his identity and sent it using WhatsApp to a driver waiting to pick him up on the other side of the frontier when — if — he made it across.

The nearly 2,000-mile trip had already cost Mr. Cruz's family more than \$6,000 and brought him within sight of Brownsville, Tex. The remaining 500 miles to Houston — terrain prowled by the United States Border Patrol as well as the state and local police — would set them back another \$6,500.

It was an almost inconceivable amount of money for someone who earned just a few dollars a day picking coffee beans back home. But he wasn't weighing the benefits of a higher-paying job. He was fleeing violence and what he said was near-certain death at the hands of local gangs.

"There's no other option," Mr. Cruz said. "The first thought I had was, 'I just need to get out of here at whatever cost.'"

The stretch of southwest border where he intended to cross has become the epicenter of the raging battle over the Trump administration's immigration crackdown. One clear consequence of the tightening American border and the growing perils getting there is that more and more desperate families are turning to increasingly sophisticated smuggling operations to get relatives into the United States.

Mr. Cruz's story provides an unusually detailed anatomy of the price of the journey. The money paid for a network of drivers who concealed him in tractor-trailers and minibuses, a series of houses where he hid out, handlers tied to criminal organizations who arranged his passage, and bribes for Mexican police officers to look the other way as he passed.

Even with his family's payment, he slept amid filth and vermin. He watched guides abandon some migrants who could not keep up, and guards prod others to become drug mules. Sometimes the smugglers identified him by a numeric code, other times by an assumed name. But as often as not, they simply called him "the package," to be moved for profit like an illicit good.

For Mr. Cruz, it was worth it. "They can build as many walls as they want," he said, referring to American officials. "They can send as many soldiers to the border as they want, but a people's need and desire for a better life is stronger."

President Trump and his supporters have called for greater vigilance along the border to keep out people like Mr. Cruz, a low-skilled worker who followed in the path of other family members who also arrived illegally, and who hopes those left behind will join him.

Pledging to halt illegal immigration, Mr. Trump has pushed for a 1,000-mile wall, ordered National Guard units to the border and encouraged workplace roundups of undocumented immigrants, which had largely been curtailed during the Obama years.

The number of illegal crossings has dropped significantly in the last decade, but responding to a surge in recent months of Central Americans arriving at the southern border or sneaking across it, the administration has embraced even tougher measures: "zero tolerance" for those arriving illegally, by requiring criminal prosecutions; family separation, a policy from which Mr. Trump was forced to retreat after images of children wailing for their parents provoked a public outcry; and eliminating domestic violence and gang violence as grounds for granting asylum to migrants who arrived at legal crossing points.

"The zero-tolerance policy and the publicity surrounding the child separations will further strengthen the smuggling networks and reinforce the patterns we have observed, as the risks, costs and fees are significantly growing," said Guadalupe Correa-Cabrera, a professor at George Mason University and an expert on organized crime. "This will certainly increase the demand for smugglers and will further strengthen the connection between human smugglers and other criminal actors, such as drug cartels and corrupt local law enforcement."

The homeland security secretary, Kirstjen Nielsen, told lawmakers in May that migrants paid \$500 million a year to groups fueling violence and instability in the region. A decade ago, Mexicans and Central Americans paid between \$1,000 and \$3,000 for clandestine passage into the United States. Now they hand over up to \$9,200 for the same journey, the Department of Homeland Security reported last year. Those figures have continued to rise, according to interviews at migrant shelters in Mexico.

To trace Mr. Cruz's journey from El Salvador, The New York Times relied on extensive interviews with him and his family, and reviewed contemporaneous photographs, text messages, receipts and GPS positions.

UNITED
STATES
Houston
San
Antonio

TEXAS
 \$6,500
 MEXICO
 McAllen
 Monterrey
 Amounts show the payments
 that Mr. Cruz's family made
 at each stage of his trip.
 Matamoros
 \$180
 \$2,800
 TAMAULIPAS
 Mr. Cruz's
 route
 SAN LUIS
 POTOSÍ
 Gulf of
 Mexico
 HIDALGO
 Guadalajara
 \$450
 Mexico City
 Puebla
 VERACRUZ
 \$1,900
 Malpaso
 Dam
 CHIAPAS
 Pacific
 Ocean
 Guatemala
 City
 \$800
 GUATEMALA
 EL SALVADOR
 San Salvador
 San Diego
 U.S. — MEXICO BORDER
 El Paso
 UNITED
 STATES
 Houston
 San
 Antonio
 TEXAS
 \$6,500
 MEXICO
 McAllen
 Monterrey
 Amounts show the payments
 that Mr. Cruz's family made
 at each stage of his trip.
 Matamoros

\$180
 \$2,800
 TAMAULIPAS
 Mr. Cruz's
 route
 SAN LUIS
 POTOSÍ
 Gulf of
 Mexico
 HIDALGO
 Guadalajara
 \$450
 Mexico City
 Puebla
 VERACRUZ
 \$1,900
 Malpaso
 Dam
 CHIAPAS
 Pacific
 Ocean
 Guatemala
 City
 \$800
 GUATEMALA
 EL SALVADOR
 San Salvador
 UNITED
 STATES
 Houston
 Mr. Cruz's
 route
 MEXICO
 TEXAS
 \$6,500
 Monterrey
 Brownsville
 \$2,800
 Matamoros
 NUEVO
 LEON
 \$180
 TAMAULIPAS
 Amounts show the payments that Mr. Cruz's family
 made at each stage of his trip.
 SAN LUIS
 POTOSÍ
 HIDALGO
 \$450
 Gulf of
 Mexico
 Mexico City
 Puebla

VERACRUZ
Malpaso
Dam
\$1,900
CHIAPAS
Pacific
Ocean
Guatemala
City
HONDURAS
GUATEMALA
San Salvador
\$800
EL SALVADOR
UNITED
STATES
Houston
MEXICO
\$6,500
Monterrey
Matamoros
\$180
\$2,800
Mr. Cruz's
route

Amounts show the payments that Mr. Cruz's family made at each stage of his trip.

\$450
Mexico City
Gulf of
Mexico
Puebla
\$1,900
Malpaso
Dam
Guatemala
City
Pacific
Ocean
\$800
San
Salvador

His uncle in the United States checked in constantly by Facebook Messenger during his weeks on the road. He asked for proof-of-life selfies and confirmed his locations along the route using the Find My iPhone app before wiring money for each leg of the journey.

A screenshot Mr. Cruz's uncle took as he tracked Mr. Cruz's progress on the journey.

A screenshot Mr. Cruz's uncle took as he tracked Mr. Cruz's progress on the journey.

| Source:

The Times also interviewed dozens of experts, academics, and current and former law enforcement officials about the underground economy of human smuggling. Reporters reviewed more than 200 recent criminal complaints in smuggling cases along the southwest border, including those brought against drivers, stash-house operators, foot guides and migrants.

That day at the Rio Grande last summer, a guide prepared to lead Mr. Cruz and some two dozen other migrants to the far side of the river while three lookouts perched in trees, scanning the horizon for any hint of the Border Patrol.

When he arrived at the crossing, Mr. Cruz found that the river wasn't wide, at most a few hundred feet, but the water was murky and full of debris. The smugglers had gathered the migrants at the water's edge, with giant inflated inner tubes for those who couldn't swim. They said the makeshift rafts were slower than swimming, so Mr. Cruz pulled off his skinny-leg khakis and T-shirt and paddled to the other side in his boxer shorts.

After climbing up the bank, his first tenuous toehold in the United States, he crouched, wet and shivering, in the brush and got dressed. Mr. Cruz's face had lost much of its roundness as he had shed 30 pounds over a month of hard travel. A life of skateboarding, tinkering with computers and eating his grandmother's cooking had not prepared him for the demands of the road.

The smugglers almost hadn't let him cross, because they worried that his coughing fits from a respiratory infection might give the group away. But he had made it. The foot guide passed along the all-clear signal from the sentries in the trees, and the small crowd of migrants began to sprint toward the 18-foot steel security fence blocking their passage into the United States. That area of the border, which Mr. Trump wants to fortify with a new wall, was already among the stretches best defended by the Americans.

Mr. Cruz had climbed halfway up the fence when he heard a helicopter overhead and saw patrol cars converging. Agents grabbed those already over the fence and began to arrest them.

"When I saw that, I slid down and I ran back," Mr. Cruz recalled. He dived again into the Rio Grande, his only hope to escape back to Mexico. Under Fear of Death

Mr. Cruz grew up in San Miguel, the fourth-largest city in El Salvador. Gang violence is virtually endemic in the country, and Mr. Cruz dropped out of high school when the infamous MS-13 became too dangerous there. His family relocated to Berlin, about an hour's drive

away, which had less of a gang problem than the big cities.

Mr. Cruz's mother lived in the United States, but he was much closer to her brother there, an uncle he considered a father figure and called "Papi." Mr. Cruz lived with his grandmother and younger sister. He also had a 2-year-old son to provide for, though he and the boy's mother had broken up.

During coffee-picking season he rose at 4 in the morning, walked an hour to the farm where he worked, then plucked ripe red coffee cherries until dark. He usually earned \$15 to \$20 a week. Outside harvest season, Mr. Cruz painted murals and cleaned streets for the local government. He briefly worked as a bartender at a restaurant an hour's bus ride away.

The police had all but declared open season on gang-age men, Mr. Cruz said, and he and his friends were harassed and beaten by the security forces. Meanwhile, gang members regularly threatened him and shook him down for money because they realized he received support from his uncle in the United States.

One night, Mr. Cruz and his friends were walking home when they noticed a blue Honda creeping behind them. When the young men started to run, the car accelerated, then followed Mr. Cruz as the group split up.

"I got to my house and it was locked," he recalled. He considered climbing over the front gate but worried the men who were following him might kill his grandmother and sister too. Over his shoulder he saw the gang members draw guns as he fled across a soccer field before taking refuge in a nearby health clinic.

After that night, he resolved to leave. "That is the reality of El Salvador," he said. "You are scared of both, the gangs and the police." He did not consider trying to enter United States legally to seek asylum; even under the more lenient asylum policies a year ago only a fraction of gang-violence victims won that status.

Mr. Cruz had never gone farther than neighboring Honduras. But in some Central American cities, smuggling services to the United States are openly promoted on the streets, with hawkers luring customers the way agents at tourist destinations advertise sailing or snorkeling excursions. They take potential customers to a back room of a nearby store, where salesmen pitch them on a smuggling route. Some would-be migrants give up homes, cars, livestock and even farmland tilled by their families for generations and take on debt to pay the fees.

Mr. Cruz's uncle, who now has legal status in the United States after arriving illegally years ago, spoke to a woman in his local Salvadoran community. She told him of smugglers who brought her three children over for a flat \$20,000 fee after gang members back home killed

her husband. The uncle used WhatsApp to contact a woman in Mexico representing the smuggling network, who became the point of contact throughout Mr. Cruz's journey.

"Would it be possible to pick up my nephew as close as possible to the edge of San Salvador?" the uncle asked her in one message. "The boy is 22 years old but acts more like 12." The uncle spoke on the condition of anonymity because he, like other relatives of unauthorized immigrants, feared he could be prosecuted for trafficking a family member.

Mr. Cruz worried about the trip. His best friend had made the same journey the year before only to be kidnapped near the American border and held for two months. His family paid \$20,000 to free him, and he ended up back in El Salvador. And a female friend of Mr. Cruz had been raped by smugglers on the American side of the border, caught by the authorities and then deported.

His uncle assured him over Facebook Messenger that everything would be fine.

Mr. Cruz's aunt and uncle earned enough to advance him the money for the journey, but Mr. Cruz would have to pay them back. They wired \$800 to El Salvador the day he set out on the initial leg of the trip. "Any opportunity you have to connect, send me a message with your location," the uncle wrote.

"Activate Find My iPhone so you can find out my location from the iCloud," Mr. Cruz answered. "That way you'll know the route I'm taking." Mr. Cruz set off for the United States with a backpack carrying three changes of clothes, deodorant, cookies and a charger for the iPhone 5 that would be his connection and lifeline. 'You Already Know How Much This Is'

His trip began with an idling pickup truck outside a mall in Soyapango, on the edge of San Salvador. The smuggler who would accompany him through El Salvador and Guatemala sat behind the wheel.

MEX.
Guatemala
City
HONDURAS
La Hachadura
GUATEMALA
San
Salvador
EL SALVADOR
Pacific Ocean

In the beginning, it was almost like being a tourist. Mr. Cruz crossed into Guatemala legally at La Hachadura, close to El Salvador's Pacific coast, with his national identity card. He even received a printed receipt.

The driver left the pickup truck behind in El Salvador and chaperoned him by bus to the capital, Guatemala City. The two of them transferred buses and traveled a few hours further to Huehuetenango, in the western highlands, which serves as a jumping-off point for the Mexican border.

They spent a night in a cheap hotel and traveled the next day to La Mesilla along the Mexican frontier. Vendors under colorful umbrellas sold drinks and snacks at the crossing. A blue sign wished travelers a “feliz viaje,” or nice trip, above the gate separating the two countries.

To skirt the border police outpost, the smuggler directed Mr. Cruz to a nearby industrial area where he walked alone up a gravel path and into Mexico. For the first time, he became an illegal immigrant.

Mr. Cruz boarded a minibus, filled with local passengers, to begin his trip through the southern state of Chiapas. As instructed by the driver, at toll plazas he hunched down between the seats and covered himself with the passengers’ backpacks, suitcases and packages. The driver whistled when it was safe to come out.

He was vulnerable to criminals who might try to kidnap him, police officers seeking bribes and the more robust immigration enforcement that has taken root in recent years in southern Mexico. Under pressure from Washington, the Mexican government has cracked down on migrants passing through its territory. Because of the greater vigilance along the smuggling routes, between 80 and 95 percent of migrants bound for the United States used so-called coyotes in recent years, compared with fewer than half in the early 1970s, Border Patrol surveys of captured migrants found.

Just two days into Mr. Cruz’s journey, his family had to wire the smuggling network \$1,900 to get him through southern Mexico.

Mr. Cruz spent several days in a small house near Tuxtla Gutiérrez, the capital of Chiapas, sleeping on a sofa. It was comfortable enough, but he wondered what the holdup was. “They want to move you even more than you do,” his uncle assured him, “because they have to pay for every day that you’re there but I don’t pay extra.”

When the smugglers finally continued the trip, Mr. Cruz spent a night on a hammock at an isolated spot near the Malpaso Dam, surrounded by trees. “I was headed for Puebla yesterday, but immigration stopped two people who had gone ahead,” he texted his uncle. “So they moved me here instead.”

The next morning, Mr. Cruz climbed into the cab of a tractor-trailer and rode alongside the driver. At a toll area, he had his first run-in with the police. Officers stopped the truck for a routine check, and after seeing

Mr. Cruz’s Salvadoran ID, realized that he was in Mexico illegally. They demanded money or else they would deport him, Mr. Cruz said.

Gulf of
Mexico
Puebla
PUEBLA
VERACRUZ
MEXICO
Malpaso Dam
OAXACA
Tuxtla Gutiérrez

He fished out \$170 he had hidden in his shoes. Mr. Cruz remembered one of the police officers telling him it was his lucky day. “I was getting out of trouble. I was able to get away because I had this money on me,” he said.

The officers stole the truck driver’s cash as well. Once they left, the driver threatened to hand the migrant over to violent drug traffickers unless Mr. Cruz got him \$600. Panicked, Mr. Cruz called his aunt and uncle in the United States for help, but they didn’t answer.

Thousands of miles away, the couple emerged from a water park — a rare day off with their young daughter — to find the missed calls. They had been observing Mr. Cruz’s progress on their smartphones and computers, watching him move northward through small towns, streets full of pastel houses and parking lots for Walmarts and Pemex gas stations.

On the phone with his relatives, he described the police theft and the driver’s threat. His uncle quickly turned to the Mexican woman at the smuggling network, who found another driver to carry Mr. Cruz to Puebla. The uncle asked Mr. Cruz to remain calm.

“Stay calm, stay calm, everyone keeps saying that,” Mr. Cruz responded in a Facebook message. “Knowing I’ve never been away from home. That I’m easily frightened in a situation like this. And you want me to keep calm and keep calm. I can’t.”

On subsequent traffic stops, the bribe for the police was always the same: 1,500 Mexican pesos, or about \$84. At first Mr. Cruz tried to lie, saying he wasn’t a migrant but was on his way to Monterrey to make a delivery. Eventually he dropped any pretense. The fourth time he was stopped for a payoff, the cop simply said, “You already know how much this is.” Doors Locked, Windows Barred

Mr. Cruz made it as far as Puebla, southeast of Mexico City and a pivot point on the journey. His family wired \$450 to the smugglers, including pocket money for Mr. Cruz for food and bribes.

The woman he stayed with in Puebla treated him well, feeding him the local delicacy “chiles en nogada,”

chiles in cream sauce with pomegranate seeds: green, white and red like the Mexican flag. She took him to buy soap, shampoo and toothpaste, but also got rid of his shoes — Bracos, a brand that the Mexican authorities would recognize as Salvadoran — and gave him another pair.

After four days there the smugglers tried to move him north, but word came that some migrants had been killed near Monterrey, his next stop, so they brought him back to Puebla. After waiting three more days, Mr. Cruz hid with a young woman and her infant son in the sleeping compartment of a tractor-trailer for the overnight drive to Monterrey.

The driver insisted they each take a pill, saying it was to keep them alert in case they were stopped. He then ground another pill into powder and mixed part of it in the baby's bottle before snorting the rest himself. Mr. Cruz said that he did not know what was in the pill but that after taking it he couldn't have slept even if he had tried.

He arrived in Monterrey, the third-largest metropolitan area in Mexico and an industrial and commercial hub. Far from the booming downtown, behind a metal front gate, the windows and doors were shut and barred on the cinder-block house where Mr. Cruz was kept. Trash was everywhere. The small courtyard was filled with mud and debris. Ants and cockroaches crawled indoors. The only water ran brown and unfiltered from the faucet. A terrible smell wafted from the bathroom.

U.S.

TEXAS

MEXICO

McAllen

Matamoros

Monterrey

"It was like a prison," Mr. Cruz said.

Migrants like Mr. Cruz had to pay their captors to bring them bottled water or snacks, if they even had the cash to pay prices that were triple those at the local convenience store. Otherwise food arrived only every other day, in the form of a carton of 30 eggs to feed the dozen or so people typically there. At night, Mr. Cruz said, he lay on a thin mat on the floor but couldn't sleep with mice and insects running over him.

Every day smugglers dropped off and picked up migrants, who were kept locked inside. A Guatemalan man everyone called "el dueño," "the owner," was in charge because he had been there the longest. He had run out of money to continue his journey a month and a half earlier.

Mr. Cruz was stuck there for four days. His uncle sent \$2,800, and they carried him onward to the eastern

Mexican border state of Tamaulipas, just below southern Texas. His journey took him first to Ciudad Miguel Alemán, across from Roma, Tex., before he boarded a bus for Matamoros, two and a half hours away, with the assumed name Carlos Hernandez on his ticket.

Tamaulipas has become known for violent confrontations between organized crime groups, and migrants caught in the middle have been massacred. In the summer of 2010, the corpses of 72 migrants killed by cartel members were discovered there in San Fernando. The message was clear: Crossing into the United States without permission from the drug traffickers, or narcos, who controlled the border territory could be lethal.

Rodolfo Casillas, an expert on illegal migration at the Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales in Mexico, estimated that up to \$1,000 of the total smuggling price went to pay off the narcos for the "derecho de paso," or right to pass. One migrant testifying in a human-smuggling case in Texas last year told the authorities that he had paid 11,000 pesos, or about \$630, for protection from the Zetas criminal organization, and just 1,500 pesos for assistance with the river crossing.

The house where Mr. Cruz was kept in Matamoros was better maintained than the hovel in Monterrey. He and the 30 other migrants could bathe with buckets of water from a pair of concrete basins with spigots outside. The men watching the house, tied to the narcos, brought them beers and even offered them drugs from bundles of cocaine and marijuana.

"If you ran out of money, that's when they would offer to cross you as a mule," Mr. Cruz said.

Some migrants at the house agreed to ferry drugs.

After sending off the migrants with drugs one day, the traffickers returned to the stash house seething. "They were extremely angry," Mr. Cruz recalled, not because the migrants had been arrested but because they had lost their shipment of drugs. Back and Forth Across the Rio Grande

Mr. Cruz was sick. The temperature along his journey had yo-yoed 40 degrees as the altitude climbed to 7,000 feet in Puebla before dropping to sea level in Matamoros. The unsanitary conditions in Monterrey probably hadn't helped.

Mr. Cruz was eager to leave the house in Matamoros, but his coughing spasms gave the smugglers pause. They didn't want him giving their position away as a group tried to slip past Border Patrol agents.

His uncle asked Mr. Cruz if the Mexican woman from the smuggling network could insist that they move him anyway. But Mr. Cruz realized she had little sway at

the border. "Someone else decides who leaves," he told his uncle, "and she pays them."

His family sent \$180 to the smugglers, who said half would go toward medicine and half for a backup phone. Doses of cough syrup, along with several days of rest, seemed to help. That Saturday night Mr. Cruz wrote to his uncle, "They're going to say if I leave in the morning." Shortly after midnight he wrote again, saying, "At 4 o'clock in the morning I go."

The region, where the Rio Grande coils and bends in switchbacks, has become the central battleground of the southwest frontier for illegal entries. Some 138,000 people were caught trying to cross here in 2017, close to half of all those apprehended from the California coast all the way to the Gulf of Mexico.

Illegal crossings fell significantly in the initial months of the Trump administration but shot up this year: From March to May, the number of migrants apprehended along the southwest border was triple the total for the same period in 2017, though far below the levels of a decade or two ago. Last year Customs and Border Protection intercepted 303,916 people there — compared with more than 1.6 million in 2000.

As part of the \$1.3 trillion spending bill that Congress passed in March, \$1.375 billion in funding went for more than 90 miles of physical barriers along the border with Mexico. Of that, 33 miles will be built in the Rio Grande Valley in southern Texas, where Mr. Cruz was trying to cross.

For all the debate about Mr. Trump's proposed wall, a virtual barrier was steadily strengthened under previous administrations. Doughy blimps equipped with cameras provide video surveillance, with thermal imaging for nighttime. Migrants unknowingly trip advanced seismic sensors with their first steps on American soil. The number of Border Patrol agents has grown to about 20,000 from roughly 9,000 in 2001, while budgets have quadrupled, spent on everything from all-terrain vehicles and horse patrols to helicopters and advanced reconnaissance drones.

That gives the Border Patrol a much better chance of combating criminal smuggling networks, which use Facebook and Craigslist to recruit drivers, satellite phones and encrypted communication applications to direct them, night-vision technology to scan for patrols, and off-the shelf tracking devices to monitor moving vehicles.

"They have evolved as the technology has evolved, and we have as well," said Benjamine Huffman, chief of strategic planning and analysis for the Border Patrol.

Early that morning, the smugglers gathered Mr. Cruz, one of two dozen migrants from two stash houses

in town, and crammed them into the back of an S.U.V., stacking them like cordwood. Wedged into a corner of the trunk with the weight of his fellow migrants crushing down on him, Mr. Cruz struggled to catch his breath.

Once at the Rio Grande, he swam to the other side, while those who couldn't swim were pulled on the inner tubes. The migrants in his group began to mount the border fence. But the Border Patrol descended, grabbing some of the first arrivals. He realized he had to turn back.

"There was no other alternative but to cross the river," Mr. Cruz said.

As was customary, the smugglers would give him three tries to make it across safely. One chance was gone. Mr. Cruz steeled himself to try again at a different bend along the river.

The temperature had climbed to 93 degrees by midday Sunday when Mr. Cruz made his second illegal visit to the United States, at another crossing nearby. It was even shorter than his first.

Border Patrol agents swarmed the group as they made landfall on the north bank again. One agent got a hand on Mr. Cruz's back but, instead of arresting him, sent him sprawling into the river. Swallowing water and struggling to stay afloat, Mr. Cruz said, he barely managed to swim back to Mexico.

The sun was low and dusk approaching by the time the coyotes brought the migrants to their third crossing point. The smugglers said the spot, more isolated, was usually reserved for moving drug shipments, more valuable than migrants. Mr. Cruz would have to swim across the Rio Grande for the fifth time that day.

Of the 17 people left from the two dozen in the morning, Mr. Cruz recalled, five were women, including one who appeared about eight months pregnant and another in her 50s, he guessed. He wondered how they would make it, but his family had warned him: Worry about yourself. Do not stop for anyone.

Mr. Cruz could hardly believe the determination of the pregnant woman as they emerged from the river again and started to run. But the older woman slipped behind and fell to the ground. The guide did nothing. "He just left her there," Mr. Cruz said. Checkpoints and Hidden Compartments

The driver of the waiting S.U.V. honked his horn to get their attention. He was angry, expecting just a few migrants to crawl out of the South Texas field and instead finding 16 people. In a region full of Border Patrol agents, it was a risky load to carry.

The driver told Mr. Cruz to ride shotgun, and he saw bundles of cocaine on the passenger seat. But it was only a short drive to a parking lot where the

smugglers separated the group into different cars, depending on their destinations. Mr. Cruz and five others got into a Cadillac headed an hour northwest to a stash house in McAllen, Tex.

Drop-offs and pickups are often meticulously planned so that migrants are ready to jump in as soon as the car pulls up. Smugglers sometimes mark migrants with colored tape to quickly sort who is going where. Smugglers often drive two cars, using one to draw the attention of law enforcement and another to carry the migrants.

Border Patrol officers have grown more aggressive in their search for unauthorized immigrants throughout the 100-mile band of territory inside the United States border, where they have authority to establish checkpoints and perform searches.

At the stash house in McAllen, the caretakers took away phones and even migrants' shoes so they wouldn't run away. "One particular person, they beat him up and kicked him because he wasn't paying attention," Mr. Cruz said.

He estimated there were 70 people inside. They were given no food and were not allowed to speak to one another or even move without permission. Neighbors in border regions can be quick to report suspected stash houses. More than a third of all those busted by Customs and Border Protection last year — 140 out of 407 in the Southwest — were in the Rio Grande Valley, where Mr. Cruz was.

After just a day and a half in McAllen, Mr. Cruz huddled with four other migrants in the sleeping compartment of a tractor-trailer headed to San Antonio. They were nearly discovered by agents during a routine search at a highway checkpoint, cowering under blankets as they felt someone check the bedding they were hiding under. Mr. Cruz was transferred to a minivan with a concealed compartment built under the back seat, where he hid for part of the ride.

Mr. Cruz was brought to one last stash house, stripped to just his boxer shorts in a room "with no electricity, no light coming through, no windows and one big bed with four men," as he described it, essentially a hostage until the final payments were made. Two days passed.

His family had to transfer the remaining \$6,500 to the smuggling network. Although a record \$28.8 billion in remittances was sent to Mexico last year, the authorities regularly flag suspicious transactions. Mr. Cruz's uncle had to break up the sum into smaller, less conspicuous transfers.

Even with the precautions, one of the payments was flagged, canceled and had to be re-sent to a different recipient. Only when the final installment arrived

in Mexico could Mr. Cruz go. "They gave me my clothes to put back on, and they blindfolded me again," he said.

The smugglers drove him to a gas station. There he saw the familiar face of his uncle. Mr. Cruz began to cry.

Relief at finishing his journey did not last long. Mr. Cruz was now in an unfamiliar country, where he did not speak the language and could not legally hold a job. He would have to hide in plain sight. He was \$12,630 in debt. But, he said, at least he didn't fear for his life. "Here I know I'm safe," he said.

His uncle found him tougher and more mature after the journey's hardships. Mr. Cruz looked ahead to earning enough money to begin the cycle again, paying for his son, his sister and his grandmother to join him in the United States. "I dream of bringing them over here," he said.

June 26, 2018

June 24, 2018

June 12, 2018

Feb. 5, 2018

IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT

Manhattan's Immigration Court Begins Video Only Hearings

The suspension of in-person hearings for detained immigrants came after protesters blocked a garage used by Immigration and Customs Enforcement agents

By Gerald Porter Jr.

[Wall Street Journal](#), June 29, 2018

Full-text stories from the Wall Street Journal are available to Journal subscribers by clicking the link.

Man Arrested On Rape Charge, Referred To ICE

[Associated Press](#), June 30, 2018

BOSTON (AP) — A Brazilian immigrant being held on rape and assault charges in Massachusetts has been referred to the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement agency.

Officials from the Barnstable County Sheriff's office say Saturday Antonio Ferreira is being held in a Bourne facility awaiting trial for rape, assault and battery and soliciting a felony.

Ferreira was previously removed from the U.S. in 2007.

The office recently entered into an agreement with ICE to train local officers to enforce some immigration laws. Police will identify inmates already wanted for deportation.

If Ferreira is found guilty, he will be deported once he has served his sentence. An attorney for Ferreira could not be immediately identified.

Copyright 2018 Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten, or redistributed.

Brazilian Rape Suspect Busted In Barnstable Was Deported In 2007

[Boston Herald](#), July 1, 2018

A Brazilian man facing rape and assault charges on Cape Cod was forcibly removed from the country 11 years ago, according to authorities who arrested him last week.

Barnstable Sheriff James M. Cummings said it is not known when Antonio Ferreira illegally re-entered the United States after he was put on a plane in Dallas and flown back to Brazil in 2007 per order of an immigration judge.

Ferreira was arrested by Cummings' deputy sheriffs last week on an active warrant out of Barnstable Superior Court charging him with rape, assault and battery and soliciting a felony.

Cummings' office this year became a working partner of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement under its 287(g) program. Ferreira is the department's first alleged immigration offender to be identified.

"This cooperative program is officially off to a good start," Cummings said. "The end result will never change. It will make our county and our country a safer place. If that means doing it one case at a time, so be it. This is exactly why we wanted to be involved in this program, so individuals like this would not be released to the community in Barnstable County."

Rebecca J. Adducci, interim field director of ICE Enforcement and Removal Operations in Boston, said she values cooperation from law enforcement partners like Cummings because "it allows for the removal of dangerous criminal illegal aliens like Ferreira."

Sheriff Cummings' ICE-Certified Deputies Assist On First 287(g) Case

[Cape Cod \(MA\) Today](#), June 29, 2018

Newly trained and newly participating deputy sheriffs at the Barnstable County Sheriff's Office on Cape Cod last week encountered their first 287(g) offender and arrested and transported him to their county facility in Bourne.

Antonio Ferreira, a citizen or national of Brazil, now awaits trial on an active warrant for rape, assault and battery, and soliciting a felony – charges formally issued

from Barnstable Superior Court (Docket# 0672CR02302).

It is not known where and when Ferreira first entered the United States, but it is known that almost 13 years ago, on August 8, 2005, he was served an Immigration Department Notice to Appear (Form I-862). Seventeen months later, in January of 2007, an immigration judge ordered him removed. He was flown back to Brazil three months after that, a departure made from the Dallas/Fort Worth airport.

The time and place of his second illegal re-entry are also unknown.

Ferreira will now be processed by Barnstable County's new 287(g) field office and the ICE field office in Boston. The paperwork required will include a Warrant of Arrest, an I-871 Notice of Intent, and what is called a decision to Reinstate Prior Order. Removal from the U.S. will be as prescribed by Section 241(a)5 of the Immigration and Naturalization Act.

Concluded James M. Cummings, the Sheriff of Barnstable County: "This cooperative program is officially off to a good start. The end result will never change. It will make our county and our country a safer place. If that means doing it one case at a time, so be it. This is exactly why we wanted to be involved in this program. So individuals like this would not be released to the community in Barnstable County."

Rebecca J. Adducci, interim Field Director of ICE Enforcement and Removal Operations in Boston, said she values cooperation from law enforcement partners like the Sheriff's Office because "it allows for the removal of dangerous criminal illegal aliens like Ferreira. The joint efforts "help to make communities throughout the Commonwealth safer every day," Adducci concluded.

Illinois Congressman Seeks Halt To Lithuanian's Extradition

[Associated Press](#), July 1, 2018

CHICAGO (AP) – A lawmaker for the Illinois district where an ex-Lithuanian parliamentarian and judge lived before being jailed in Chicago at Lithuania's request has proposed legislation to suspend extradition proceedings until a decision on her political-asylum request.

U.S. Rep. Randy Hultgren introduced the bill last week . Lithuania wants 47-year-old Neringa Venckiene (vehn-KEE'-ehn-nay) on slander and other charges stemming from her allegations that a ring of Lithuanian pedophiles victimized her 4-year-old niece.

The Republican's bill is called the "Give Judge Venckiene Her Day in Court Act." Venckiene fears those angered by her allegations could kill her in Lithuania. A New Jersey Republican introduced similar legislation.

Venckiene fled Lithuania in 2013, living in Crystal Lake and working as a florist until her February arrest.

A judge is also considering a stay. Venckiene's next hearing is July 12.

Copyright 2018 Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten, or redistributed.

ICE Arrests Three From El Salvador In Santa Fe

[Albuquerque \(NM\) Journal](#), June 30, 2018

SANTA FE, N.M. — U.S. Immigration and Customs (ICE) says three ICE “fugitives” from El Salvador have been arrested in Santa Fe.

An ICE statement in response to Journal questions says that on June 13 and 14 in Santa Fe, the agency “administratively arrested” a 46-year-old man with a “final order of removal” from 2005 and who has previously been deported twice, in 2009 and 2013; a 38-year-old man who had been ordered removed in absentia in 2005; and a 32-year-old woman who was ordered removed in absentia in 2014.

All three remain in ICE custody pending their removal to El Salvador, ICE said.

There have been unconfirmed reports of ICE arresting many restaurant workers over the past two weeks. Restaurant owners contacted by the Journal have declined to comment.

Marcela Díaz, executive director of immigrants rights group Somos Un Pueblo Unido, said Friday that she hadn't heard anything about “dozens” of restaurant workers being taken. But she said it's clear ICE has become increasingly aggressive.

“We haven't seen them in the past trying to reach people in the workplace. That's a different tactic they're using,” she said.

Another new tactic appears to be stopping vehicles on their way to work or school. “In the instances of vehicle stops they are asking for license and registration, but they are not police officers,” she said, adding that it appears ICE is targeting certain individuals.

“These families are being terrorized,” she said. “These aggressive tactics that are taking place are putting people on edge and disrupting their lives — and hurting the local economy.”

In the statement provided to the Journal, an official said, “ICE no longer exempts classes or categories of removable aliens from potential enforcement. All of those in violation of the immigration laws may be subject to immigration arrest, detention and — if found removable by final order — removal from the United States.”

Deportation Fears Erased For Green-card Carrying Arleta Resident Picked Up By ICE At His Home

By Brenda Gazzar

[Los Angeles Daily News](#), June 29, 2018

Jose Luis Garcia and his family members wept and supporters cheered after the longtime green-card holder who was picked up by immigration officials earlier this month was granted his application for relief in immigration court Friday, meaning he no longer faces deportation.

Garcia, 62, of Arleta, wearing a neon green jumpsuit when brought into the court in handcuffs, was set to be released Friday night from an Immigration and Customs Enforcement processing office in Santa Ana, according to his immigration attorney Mackenzie Mackins. He was born in Mexico and came to this country when he was 13 years old.

Garcia, who works as a machine operator, Uber driver and personal trainer, was picked up by ICE officials on June 10 as he watered his lawn and sipped his morning coffee.

“I'm so happy,” his daughter Natalie Garcia, 32, said as she wept outside the immigration courtroom with her 6-year-old daughter at her side. “The nightmare is over.... I get to take him home.”

Los Angeles Immigration Court Judge Tara Naselow-Nahas ruled that Garcia can keep his green card, which he has held for 30 years, and stay in the United States. He can now apply to become a naturalized citizen.

Due to certain discretionary factors, “he can be released from immigration custody, receive his green card back from immigration and can go on with life as normal,” Mackins told reporters after the hearing.

Such factors can include good moral character, community support, the fact that he has a job and pays taxes and does not pose a threat to the community, she said.

Mackins called it “extremely rare” for a case to be brought to resolution so quickly. But she said the dozens of supporters who attended, along with the media attention of the case, were key factors.

These cases generally take from from at least a few months up to several years to go through court, she said.

When questioned by the judge, Garcia said he was arrested in 1987 for refusing to move out of his ex-wife's home 30 days after receiving an eviction notice.

“I refused to get out of the house,” he said. “Now, I understand it wasn't the right thing.”

In 2001, he was convicted for a misdemeanor involving a domestic dispute in which the neighbors called police, he said. Both he and his wife Maria Dolores Garcia said he never laid a hand on her during the incident.

Garcia also told the judge that since that incident, he never had any interactions with police or any other convictions.

Family members and friends, wearing pins that said #FreeJoseLuisGarcia, hugged and congratulated one another outside the courtroom after letting out shrieks of joy.

"I'm happy. I'm excited," Garcia's son, Joe Garcia, said after the hearing. "I'm just hoping he goes home right after this, that's it, and (we'll) start cooking (for him)."

CRIMINAL INVESTIGATIONS

Has Trump 'Watched ICE Liberate Towns From The Grasp Of MS-13'?

By Jacey Fortin

[New York Times](#), July 1, 2018

In a series of tweets on Saturday, President Trump defended United States immigration authorities.

The tweets — interspersed with others about Saudi Arabian oil production and a new book by the former White House press secretary Sean Spicer — referred to the fight against the transnational gang MS-13.

One claim stood out:

The Democrats are making a strong push to abolish ICE, one of the smartest, toughest and most spirited law enforcement groups of men and women that I have ever seen. I have watched ICE liberate towns from the grasp of MS-13 & clean out the toughest of situations. They are great!

This is an exaggeration.

United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement agents have arrested hundreds of MS-13 members in recent months, but the president did not present evidence to show that any particular towns had been liberated from the gang.

MS-13, or Mara Salvatrucha, was founded in Los Angeles by Salvadoran refugees fleeing a civil war in the 1980s. It is believed to have more than 10,000 members in the United States, according to the Justice Department — similar to an estimate the F.B.I. made more than a decade ago.

It was unclear which towns Mr. Trump was referring to, and neither the White House nor ICE immediately responded to requests for clarification on

Saturday. MS-13 members in the United States are mostly concentrated in or around Los Angeles, Washington and Long Island in New York.

ICE provided data to The New York Times showing that 796 members of MS-13 were arrested in the fiscal year that ended in September, and 405 were arrested in the first quarter of the current fiscal year.

Members of the gang have committed brutal rapes and grisly murders, mostly targeting members of immigrant communities. The Justice Department has made fighting MS-13 a top priority under Mr. Trump, and the White House website refers to gang members as "animals."

Critics of the administration's immigration policies say the president uses MS-13 to stoke unfounded fears about immigrants.

Mr. Trump's defense of ICE was posted after some critics of the administration said the agency should be shut down.

"The Democrats are making a strong push to abolish ICE, one of the smartest, toughest and most spirited law enforcement groups of men and women that I have ever seen," he wrote.

Abolishing ICE has not been embraced as part of the Democratic Party platform. But calls to shut down the agency are coming from progressive Democratic House candidates like Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez in New York, Deb Haaland in New Mexico and Matt Haggman in Florida.

In another tweet, Mr. Trump said: "To the great and brave men and women of ICE, do not worry or lose your spirit. You are doing a fantastic job of keeping us safe by eradicating the worst criminal elements."

The tweets were posted on Saturday morning, just as thousands of people across the United States gathered to march in protest over immigration policies that have led to the separation of more than 2,000 children from their parents.

Mr. Trump signed an order meant to end the separations last week, and a federal judge ordered on Tuesday that all separated families should be reunited within 30 days.

The Trump administration has often pointed to a "crisis of illegal immigration" at the United States border. But government data show that monthly crossings along the border with Mexico are much lower than they were years ago, even though there has been a significant increase in border crossings in the past few months when compared with the same period last year.

He asserted that Representative Nancy Pelosi, the House Democratic leader, "wants to protect" MS-13 — something she has not said. And he has said that the

number of MS-13 members who have been deported is in the “thousands,” which is not possible.

MS-13 Beat Me Up And Threatened To Kill Me. Then The US Government Took My Kids.

By Jessika L.

[USA Today](#), July 1, 2018

I crossed the border into the United States on March 13 in search of safety for myself and my sons, ages 4 and 10. We had fled for our lives from El Salvador, where MS-13 gang members had threatened to kill us. We turned ourselves in to the first Border Patrol officers we saw after crossing into Texas. They took us to a Border Patrol station, where I tried to explain that my sons and I needed protection. I could never have imagined immigration authorities would take my children away from me for seeking asylum.

The immigration officers told me that I was going to be taken to an immigration detention center. They said my sons could not come with me. I was given only five minutes to say goodbye. My babies started crying. It breaks my heart to remember my youngest wail, “Why do I have to leave? Mami, I want to stay with you!” My oldest was confused and did not understand what was happening.

Through my tears, I asked them to be brave and promised that we would be together again soon. I begged the woman who took my sons to keep them together. She promised that she would, and then left with my boys. I did what any parent would do.

In El Salvador, gang members threatened me and threatened my children, too, saying they would take my 10-year-old son from me. I went to the authorities in El Salvador and requested protection, but they didn't do anything.

Once, the gang members beat me in front of my children. After that, my older son was terrified that they would kill or kidnap me, and he never wanted to leave my side, even to go to the bathroom. He didn't want to go to school, because he was afraid he would not find me when he came home. My 4-year-old slept in bed with me, and my 10-year-old slept in his own bed in the same room.

I feared not just for my safety but also for my children, so I did what I believe any responsible parent would do — tried to get them to safety. I have family in the United States, and they said they were willing to take us in.

Then, immigration authorities made my sons' worst fears come true. They left them without their mother.

After my sons were taken away, I was transferred to the Laredo Detention Center. I called the Office of Refugee Resettlement to find out what happened to my children, but they just told me that my boys were in custody in San Antonio. I couldn't talk to my sons to see how they were doing or to tell them I love them. At one point, I learned that my sons were separated and placed in two different foster homes for a time. I can't begin to say how desperate I felt knowing that they were alone, among strangers.

Finally, on May 8, after nearly two months in government custody, my children were released to my relatives on the East Coast. I am grateful that my boys were with family, and I could finally talk to them on the telephone. But my sons had no prior relationship to these relatives, and I knew they needed their mother. I was an MS-13 victim.

Before we were separated, I had never spent a night away from my children. I asked to be released from immigration detention so I could be with my them, but when I had my immigration hearing, the government alleged that I had an affiliation with a gang. I tried to explain that I was in fact a victim of the gang. As I said in my sworn affidavit, “I have never been a part of or aided the gangs in El Salvador.”

But the judge set a bond of \$12,500.

Thankfully, people from all around the country donated money for my bond through a fund set up by the Refugee and Immigrant Center for Education and Legal Services in Texas. I was reunited with my sons on June 7, after we had been separated for almost three months.

I was so relieved and happy to hold my sons again. But I still think about other mothers who are sick with worry about their own children who were taken from them. I pray that people put themselves in my shoes and theirs, and think about how difficult it must be for mothers to be away from their children.

\$1.7M In Fentanyl From China Detected By Drug-sniffing Dog At Philadelphia Port

[Fox News](#), July 1, 2018

A routine inspection at a Philadelphia port last week resulted in the confiscation of \$1.7 million worth of the dangerous opioid fentanyl, which had been shipped from China, federal authorities said.

A drug-sniffing dog detected the fentanyl inside barrels of iron oxide, Philadelphia's FOX 29 reported.

U.S. Customs and Border Protection agents found 50 packages of the “white, powdery substance,” a CBP release said. Officers later positively identified the substance as fentanyl.

The drugs weighed a total of 110 pounds, and had a street value of \$34,000 per kilogram, authorities said.

"Opioids, including fentanyl and its analogues, are a serious public health concern, and the importation of vast amounts of this deadly synthetic chemical compound is a national security threat," the release said, quoting a CBP agent. "Customs and Border Protection remains committed to keeping our communities safe by combatting the flow of illicit drugs, including synthetic opioids, into the United States."

According to CBP, fentanyl seizures have been on the rise since the agency began recording the seizures in 2016. In that year, officers seized 440 pounds nationally. The number grew to 951 pounds in 2017, 984 pounds by April 2017.

On Tuesday, the Philadelphia Inquirer reported that 20 crack cocaine users had overdosed during the preceding 10 days. Two of those people, the report said, had unknowingly consumed fentanyl.

Bradford Betz is an editor for Fox News. Follow him on Twitter @bradford_betz.

SECRET SERVICE

'Stuttering John' Says He Was Visited By Secret Service After Trump Prank Call

By Adam Shaw

[Fox News](#), June 30, 2018

A shock jock comedian who was patched through to President Trump on Air Force One after impersonating a Democratic senator claimed on Saturday he was visited by the Secret Service after his prank went public.

Comedian John Melendez of "The Stuttering John" podcast posted audio on Thursday of his conversation with the president, where Melendez claimed to be Sen. Bob Menendez, D-N.J. The two appear to have spoken while Trump flew back from North Dakota on Air Force One.

A senior White House official declined to comment to Fox News about the call, citing security issues.

But on Saturday, Melendez tweeted that he had been visited by the Secret Service, though he said he didn't answer the door.

"Secret Service at my door. I guess my old friend Donald wants to continue this," he tweeted. "Stay tuned."

He later said he was at an undisclosed location.

The alleged visit comes as Politico reports that the White House is scrambling to figure out how the prank caller got Trump on the line.

During the podcast, Melendez played audio of his call to the White House switchboard, where he claimed

he needed to talk to the president immediately about pending legislation.

He reached several White House operators before being told the president would call him back. According to the comedian, senior White House adviser Jared Kushner returned the call, connecting him to Trump.

"Hi, Bob!" the voice identified as Trump is heard saying as he picks up the phone, apparently from Air Force One.

He referenced last year's mistrial in the high-profile bribery case against Menendez, indicating he sympathized with the Democratic senator's case.

"Congratulations on everything," he said. "We're proud of you. Congratulations. Great job. You went through a tough, tough situation. And I don't think a very fair situation, but congratulations."

The pair also discussed issues from illegal immigration to the replacement of Justice Anthony Kennedy on the Supreme Court. Trump told Melendez that he was planning to make a decision "over the next two weeks."

On his Twitter account, Melendez blasted Trump for allegedly being more concerned with going after him than the staffers responsible for the botch.

"Alright I guess Donald is more concerned with pursuing this legally as opposed as to firing his screening staff," he tweeted

Fox News' Alex Pappas and Matt Leach contributed to this report.

Adam Shaw is a reporter covering U.S. and European politics for Fox News.. He can be reached [here](#).

He Gripped No One Cared About His Prank Call To Trump. Then, He Said, The Secret Service Knocked.

By Cleve R. Wootson Jr. And Felicia Sonmez

[Washington Post](#), June 30, 2018

On Thursday, John Melendez said he had prank-called the president of the United States — on Air Force One no less — and was irked that the news media hadn't taken widespread notice of what, in his particular line of work, would amount to a Super Bowl victory.

Two days later, Melendez said he stood quietly behind his front door, hoping that Secret Service agents who'd come knocking would leave without a fuss. He said that agents later identified themselves to his neighbors.

For Melendez, better known by his moniker on "the Howard Stern Show," Stuttering John, the recognition that a wider audience was taking notice of his

presidential prank had come in speedy, potentially arrestable fashion.

In the call, posted on Melendez's podcast, the comic poses as Sen. Robert Menendez (D-N.J.) and appears to be patched through to Trump while the president is aboard Air Force One on his way back to Washington after a rally in Fargo, N.D.

Of course, it is difficult to independently verify if Melendez actually reached the president. The prank could be on Melendez's listeners, not Trump. Neither the White House, nor the Secret Service have returned calls to confirm Melendez's claims about the prank call and resulting visit.

Secret Service at my door. I guess my old friend Donald wants to continue this. Stay tuned.— John Melendez (@stutteringjohnm) June 30, 2018

Secret Service is knocking. Unbelievable.— John Melendez (@stutteringjohnm) June 30, 2018

Alright, I didn't answer & they have left, but my neighbors said they showed their badges.— John Melendez (@stutteringjohnm) June 30, 2018

In the audio recording of "The Stuttering John Podcast," a voice that sounds a lot like President Trump's says "Hi, Bob," before going on to congratulate "Menendez." The New Jersey Democrat fended off a challenger this month in a closer-than-expected Senate primary after avoiding conviction in a federal corruption trial last year.

"You went through a tough, tough situation — and I don't think a very fair situation — but congratulations," says the voice that sounds like that of Trump.

Melendez and "Trump" then chat about immigration policy and the process of choosing a Supreme Court nominee before wrapping up their conversation a few minutes later.

[Colbert apologizes to ISIS, recently unseated by Trump as 'the enemy of the American People']

"You take care," says the voice that sounds like Trump's, at the end of the call. "I will speak to you soon, Bob. Take care of yourself."

The supposed prank call with the president follows reports that Trump's use of government-issued smartphones may open him up to security risks. The president also faced criticism last year for discussing the sensitive issue of how the United States should respond to a North Korean ballistic missile test while on the terrace of his Mar-a-Lago Club in Palm Beach, as waiters and curious patrons watched and snapped photos.

Melendez, who left Stern's show in 2004 and went on to work as an announcer for Jay Leno's "Tonight Show," has long been known for ambushing celebrities with embarrassing questions. In one appearance, he

asked Gennifer Flowers at her 1992 news conference about her affair with Bill Clinton, "Will you be sleeping with any other presidential candidates?"

Melendez said in an interview with CNN on Friday that he was "shocked" that he was able to successfully reach the president.

"I mean, we did this as a goof; I'm a comedian," Melendez said. "I just could not believe that it took us an hour and a half to get Jared Kushner and Donald Trump on the phone from Air Force One." Kushner is Trump's senior adviser and son-in-law.

A day later, Melendez joked that he was on the run. "I can't (stay) at my house because I have my kids this weekend & it's my last opportunity before I go (to) the big house," he joked.

Then he jokingly mused about the time he will spend locked up.

Please help me with my new go fund me. Page to pay to get out of this. Kidding, 3 years in prison is rent free.— John Melendez (@stutteringjohnm) June 30, 2018

"I'm currently at an undisclosed location. Sorry, love you all but I have to go to sleep. Red, can I get a rock hammer?"

Comedian Claims Secret Service Visited Him After He Tricked Trump Into Phone Call

By Avery Anapol

[The Hill](#), June 30, 2018

Comedian John Melendez claimed in a series of tweets late Friday night that the Secret Service came to his door after he says he tricked President Trump into speaking with him on the phone.

"Secret Service at my door," Melendez tweeted. "I guess my old friend Donald wants to continue this. Stay tuned."

Secret Service at my door. I guess my old friend Donald wants to continue this. Stay tuned.— John Melendez (@stutteringjohnm) June 29, 2018

Melendez made headlines Friday after he uploaded audio to his podcast, "The Stuttering John Podcast," purporting to reveal him posing as Sen. Bob Menendez (D-N.J.) and briefly speaking with the president about immigration.

Melendez blasted the Secret Service attempt to arrest him as "unbelievable," tweeting that they should arrest presidential adviser and son-in-law Jared Kushner "for putting the call through."

"Shame on Donald Trump who has been a friend of mine for years," he tweeted.

Secret service about to arrest me. Unbelievable! They should arrest Jared Kushner for putting the call through, shame on Donald Trump who has been a friend of mine for years.— John Melendez (@stutteringjohnm) June 30, 2018

The comedian said that he did not answer the door and the agents left without arresting him, but that his neighbors “said they showed their badges.”

Alright I guess Donald is more concerned with pursuing this legally as opposed as to firing his screening staff.— John Melendez (@stutteringjohnm) June 29, 2018

I’m

Not answering the door.— John Melendez (@stutteringjohnm) June 29, 2018

Alright, I didn’t answer & they have left, but my neighbors said they showed their badges.— John Melendez (@stutteringjohnm) June 29, 2018

Melendez also said that Michael Avenatti, the lawyer representing adult-film star Stormy Daniels in her lawsuit against Trump, has offered to represent him if necessary.

Michael Avenatti has agreed to consider repping me, but right now, seriously I’m in the lamb. I can’t say at my house because I have my kids this weekend & it’s my last opportunity before I go the big house... that’s my ex- wife’s house, she got everything in the divorce.— John Melendez (@stutteringjohnm) June 29, 2018

I made a living at pretending I’m a reporter, which Donald Trump knows, & was a fan of, why would he have me arrested for duping him.— John Melendez (@stutteringjohnm) June 29, 2018

Comedian Who Allegedly Prank-called Trump Says He Has Hired Michael Avenatti

By Morgan Gstalter

[The Hill](#), July 1, 2018

The comedian who claims he prank-called President Trump by posing as a Democratic senator said on Sunday he has hired Stormy Daniels’s attorney Michael Avenatti to represent him.

John Melendez tweeted late Sunday night that he has hired Avenatti to represent him, hours before he is allegedly scheduled to meet with Secret Service.

“I have just spoken to my new attorney @MichaelAvenatti who has agreed to represent me on this. Stay tuned,” Melendez tweeted.

I have just spoken to my new attorney @MichaelAvenatti who has agreed to represent me on this. Stay tuned.— John Melendez (@stutteringjohnm) July 2, 2018

Melendez asked Avenatti for his help on Sunday after saying he had been contacted by Secret Service agents.

Breaking: Secret Service contacted me agent & wants me to meet with them tomorrow. Stay tuned, Avenatti, can you come with me?— John Melendez (@stutteringjohnm) July 1, 2018

I am meeting with the Secret Service tomorrow at 10am. @MichaelAvenatti I need your help.— John Melendez (@stutteringjohnm) July 1, 2018

Avenatti appeared to confirm the partnership by sharing Melendez’s tweet.

He also took a jab at the controversy surrounding Trump’s “zero tolerance” immigration policy that has separated thousands of migrant children from their parents.

“Instead of wasting time on this, Mr. Trump should focus on the numerous other things that are of a greater priority,” Avenatti tweeted. “Let’s start with reuniting over 2,000 children with their parents immediately.”

Instead of wasting time on this, Mr. Trump should focus on the numerous other things that are of a greater priority. Let’s start with reuniting over 2,000 children with their parents immediately. #Basta #FightClub <https://t.co/BGcDE4ChOk>— Michael Avenatti (@MichaelAvenatti) July 2, 2018

The White House has reportedly launched an internal investigation into how Melendez was able to get connected with the president.

Melendez said last week that he tricked Trump into believing he was New Jersey Sen. Bob Menendez (D).

In audio uploaded to his “The Stuttering John Podcast,” Melendez appears to chat with Trump.

Melendez brings up the current migrant crisis and Trump’s executive order to stop separating migrant families at the southern border.

It was reportedly Trump adviser and son-in-law Jared Kushner who connected the call.

“This just shows you how easy it is to infiltrate the White House,” Melendez said on the podcast.

Two CNN anchors burst out into laughter on Saturday talking about the prank call.

EMERGENCY RESPONSE

After Court Order, FEMA Allows Hurricane Maria Survivors To Stay In Hotels 5 Additional Days

By Joshua Hoyos

[ABC News](#), July 1, 2018

A federal judge has approved a temporary restraining order that allows the nearly 1,800 Puerto

Rican survivors of Hurricane Maria to stay in temporary housing for another four days.

The FEMA-funded Transitional Sheltering Assistance for 1,744 Maria victims was set to end at checkout time Sunday. U.S. District Judge Leo Sorokin ruled that the program will continue until at least midnight July 3, 2018, enabling people to stay until checkout time on July 4, 2018.

Sorokin cited the potential for "irreparable harm" for victims who would be left homeless. He added the "specter of many sick individuals without homes of their own being rendered homeless with the resulting drain on other public resources in addition to the possible human consequences."

In a statement, William Booher, FEMA's public affairs director, said the agency is working to notify hotels that the TSA program has been extended until July 5.

Some 7,030 families have benefited from the program since Oct. 30, 2017, according to the agency. The program has been extended numerous times after Hurricanes Irma and Maria hit on Sept. 7 and Sept. 20, 2017, respectively.

The agency also said that the Transportation Assistance to get Maria survivors from the U.S. mainland back to Puerto Rico has been extended for another 60 days. Displaced people will now have until August 30 to have FEMA cover the cost of airfare, luggage and pet fees to return home.

Ariana Colon, who is pregnant and living with her boyfriend and 1-year-old child in a Central Florida hotel room, told WFTV that she is among those who were affected following Maria.

"We came here because of the situation that pushed us to come here with nothing but maybe a suitcase with some clothes and that's it," Colon said.

U.S. Sen. Bob Menendez, D-N.J., and six other senators Thursday wrote a letter to FEMA Administrator Brock Long, urging him to extend the deadline.

"Given the continuing housing needs of displaced individuals and families after Hurricane Maria, we urge you to grant a sixty-day extension of the TSA program," the senators wrote.

The Puerto Rico Electric Power Authority reported that 2,344 customers are still without power after Hurricane Maria, continuing the longest blackout in U.S. history.

Housing Extended For 1,700 Puerto Rican Hurricane Evacuees

By Sarah Betancourt And Kelli Kennedy
[Associated Press](#), July 1, 2018

A judge ordered federal emergency officials to extend vouchers for temporary hotel housing for nearly 1,700 Puerto Rican hurricane evacuees, saying ending the program could cause irreparable harm.

Saturday night's decision came shortly after civil rights group LatinoJustice PRLDEF filed a lawsuit seeking relief for the Puerto Ricans, whose federal housing assistance vouchers were set to expire at midnight Sunday, meaning the evacuees could have been evicted from the hotels.

The order says the agency cannot end its Transitional Sheltering Assistance program until at least midnight on Tuesday. The organization is pushing to let families stay another six months.

U.S. District Judge Leo Sorokin of Massachusetts wrote that ending the program would drain other public resources. He also said the evidence showed problems with the Federal Emergency Management Agency's efforts to notify and provide transitional help for the hurricane refugees.

"The irreparable harm to the plaintiffs is obvious and overwhelming; tomorrow morning they will be evicted and homeless since by definition each plaintiff's home was rendered uninhabitable by the hurricane in Puerto Rico," he wrote.

Eight plaintiffs filed a class action alleging unlawful action by FEMA in Massachusetts, which has the highest number of evacuee families seeking federal help after Florida and Puerto Rico.

Many of the plaintiffs tell stories of wiped out residences on the island, and ongoing medical conditions.

Forty-eight-year-old Denise Nieves resides in a hotel under the TSA program in West Springfield, Massachusetts, with her son. Her home in Toa Baja, Puerto Rico was flooded and is uninhabitable. Her son suffers from neurological dysfunctions while she has pulmonary hypertension. She has not been able to find permanent housing. The complaint says "they will be left homeless" in the event of eviction from the hotel.

FEMA declined to comment on the lawsuit, but the Orlando Sentinel reports the agency confirmed it was working to notify hotels to extend the aid until July 5 to comply with the order. A spokeswoman also said the agency was extending transportation aid until August 30 to cover travel costs for families who wish to return to the island.

Keith Turi, a FEMA administrator for the program, said in a video news release that the agency is working with state and local officials and volunteer organizations to find assistance for the evacuees and will help pay for a flight home.

Craig J. de Recat is a partner with Manatt, Phelps & Phillips, the law firm working pro bono with LatinoJustice on the suit.

He said evacuees had not been informed properly of the end of the program, with many finding out about the news from watching television.

He said a hearing is planned for Monday to see if the restraining order should be extended.

The Puerto Ricans arrived after last year's Hurricane Maria, a Category 4 storm that devastated the U.S. island. It caused more than \$100 billion in damage when it hit Puerto Rico on Sept. 20, and the island is still struggling to recover. Tens of thousands of businesses closed after people fled.

Florida Democratic Sen. Bill Nelson said Saturday that FEMA could extend the program under current law. He said a similar extension occurred more than a decade ago after Hurricane Katrina caused thousands from Louisiana to flee to Texas.

Nelson and Democratic members of the Florida Legislature said officials have told them the island remains too devastated to take back evacuees who remain on the mainland. There are few jobs, they said.

At a Super 8 in Orlando, there were up to 33 families staying at the motel in mid-May.

One of its occupants, 49-year-old Lizbeth Cruz, told the Orlando Sentinel that she's not going back to Puerto Rico, saying she doesn't trust the government to deal with another disaster.

She carries around a small notebook filled with pages of hand-written addresses in nearby counties with leasing office phone numbers, price ranges and annotations: Call back. Visit in person. Not available.

Kennedy reported from Fort Lauderdale, Florida.

Copyright 2018 Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten, or redistributed.

Judge Delays Aid Deadline For Displaced Puerto Ricans After Last-minute Lawsuit By Advocacy Groups

By Bianca Padró Ocasio

[Orlando \(FL\) Sentinel](#), July 1, 2018

Citing "deficiencies" in federal assistance to Puerto Rican evacuees, a judge Saturday night ordered the Federal Emergency Management Agency to extend the temporary hotel voucher program.

Hundreds of displaced families in Florida, and nearly 1,700 across the country, could benefit from the temporary court order. For many, it was a last minute

reprieve from having to leave their temporary hotel rooms 11 a.m. Sunday at 11 a.m.

Hurricane Maria survivors under the Transitional Sheltering Assistance program can now stay in their hotels at least until Wednesday, according to the ruling.

The temporary injunction issued Saturday was prompted by a lawsuit filed in Massachusetts by the advocacy organizations LatinoJustice and Vamos4PR as well as several affected families. They are suing the Federal Emergency Management Agency, its administrator William Brock Long and regional director Alejandro De La Campa.

"The irreparable harm to the plaintiffs is obvious and overwhelming tomorrow morning they will be evicted and homeless since by definition each plaintiffs home was rendered uninhabitable by the hurricane in Puerto Rico," U.S. District Judge Leo Sorokin wrote in his decision, adding that the evidence provided showed "deficiencies in notice and transition assistance" for evacuees.

Sorokin said the end of the TSA program would have "possible human consequences" and would "drain on other public resources."

FEMA declined to comment on the lawsuit. But in a statement Sunday, the agency confirmed it was working to notify hotels to extend the aid until July 5 to comply with the order.

Spokesperson Dasha Castillo said FEMA was also extending transportation aid until August 30 to cover travel costs for families who wish to return to the island.

The agency has previously said that activating the Disaster Housing Assistance Program, which has been pushed for by some Democrats and Puerto Rico officials, would present "additional complexities and red tape" for survivor families.

"DHAP can become an additional burden for disaster survivors as it requires them to find a rental unit before they can be assisted by the local Public Housing Agency," according to an earlier statement from FEMA spokespeople.

Kira Romero-Craft, a managing attorney with LatinoJustice in Orlando, said the lawsuit was filed on the eve of the final deadline because she said litigation is always used "as the last option."

"We kept pushing our elected officials," she said. "But unfortunately no one came through."

Romero-Craft added that their organization was suing for an opportunity to let families stay under the TSA program for at least six more months, and for FEMA to review the cases of people who they believe have particular and special needs.

She stressed that although many Puerto Rican families have been able to find apartments or decided to

return to Puerto Rico, there is a smaller group on the mainland that is still facing homelessness.

"There are folks that are sick, elderly, retired ... It's a small percentage and they need our help."

The groups are also claiming that the aid that has been rejected for Puerto Ricans on the mainland 10 months after Maria is unequal to the aid provided for survivors of Hurricane Katrina and Hurricane Sandy.

"These folks are the ones that are living paycheck to paycheck ... it's completely unacceptable," Romero-Craft said. "Why haven't the officials, after 10 months, [done] what they're supposed to do?"

In a statement on Thursday, Gov. Rick Scott's office said the state had no authority to request and extension and that the program was expiring "following a decision by the Puerto Rican government to not request an extension from FEMA."

He said impacted families should contact their county's emergency management office.

Orange County Mayor Teresa Jacobs asked the federal agency on Thursday to "provide immediate one-on-one assistance" to the families, citing the state's shortage of affordable homes.

The court decision marks the fifth extension of the temporary program, which was first activated on the mainland in October. Saturday's deadline was announced on May 3, after FEMA granted a final request from the Puerto Rican government to support families with children who were in the middle of their school year.

bpadro@orlandosentinel.com or 407-232-0202.
Follow me on Twitter @BiancaJoanie

COAST GUARD

American Tourist Dies In Boat Explosion In The Bahamas

By Marilia Brocchetto And Emanuella Grinberg
[CNN](#), July 1, 2018

(CNN)At least one American tourist is dead and ten people were injured after a tour boat exploded in the Bahamas, according to the Royal Bahamas Police Force.

The explosion occurred shortly after 9 a.m. Saturday in waters off Barratterre island in the Exuma Cays, police said in a statement.

The 40-foot chartered tour boat was carrying ten tourists and two Bahamians when an engine exploded, engulfing the vessel in flames, the statement said.

Chester Cooper, a member of parliament for Exumas and Ragged Island, identified the person who died as an American woman.

"This is a sad day for Exuma and a sad day for our American friends. We are saddened and our hearts are hurting, but we will get through this together," Cooper said in a Facebook post.

Four Americans were airlifted to a hospital in Florida, the US Coast Guard Southeast said.

Cooper said others were treated at Princess Margaret Hospital in the Bahamian capital of Nassau, including the boat's captain, who is also the owner of 4 C's Adventures tour company. He was discharged from the hospital.

The cause of the incident is under investigation by the Exuma branch of the Royal Bahamas Police Force, the USCG said.

Ursula Perano contributed to this report.

7 Rescued In Alaska Waters After Fishing Boat Sinks

[Associated Press](#), June 29, 2018

ANCHORAGE, Alaska (AP) — The Coast Guard rescued seven people from a lifeboat Friday morning in southeast Alaska waters after their fishing boat ran aground and sank.

Coast Guard officials say the rescued people were in good condition when they were taken by a Coast Guard response boat crew to a pier in Thorne Bay.

Officials say a search was launched after an emergency positioning beacon went off and the master of the 58-foot (18-meter) Mystic Lady issued a mayday broadcast reporting the vessel struck a rock and was quickly sinking.

The Coast Guard says the vessel's occupants waited for rescuers on the inflatable raft in Thorne Bay after they abandoned ship.

Officials say there were no immediate reports of pollution. The boat carried 350 gallons of diesel and 25 gallons of lube oil.

Copyright 2018 Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten, or redistributed.

US Coast Guard: Despite Law Pot Illegal On Lake Champlain

[Associated Press](#), July 1, 2018

MONTPELIER, Vt. (AP) — The U.S. Coast Guard is reminding boaters that despite Vermont's new law legalizing recreational marijuana, the use of marijuana remains illegal on Lake Champlain.

On Sunday the possession and use of small amounts of marijuana becomes legal in Vermont. But under federal law marijuana is still a controlled

substance and possession or use remains a federal offense.

The Coast Guard says crews will continue to enforce all federal laws, including those relating to the transport, use and possession of marijuana.

Officials say operating a vessel under the influence of alcohol or drugs remains a significant threat to public safety. The Coast Guard may board commercial and recreational vessels on international, federal, and state waterways to ensure safety and security.

Copyright 2018 Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten, or redistributed.

CYBER NEWS

China's ZTE Shakes Up Board In Bid For U.S. Ban Lift

By Sue-Lin Wong

[Reuters](#), June 29, 2018

Full-text stories from Reuters currently cannot be included in this document. You may, however, click the link above to access the story.

ZTE Appoints Chairman In Another Step Toward Lifting Of U.S. Ban

[Bloomberg News](#), June 29, 2018

ZTE Corp. has appointed a new chairman from a state research outfit that backed its founding decades ago, taking another step toward cleaning house and freeing itself from a ban on American technology purchases.

Shareholders voted in Li Zixue, the 54-year-old deputy director of the Xi'an Microelectronics Technology Institute, as chairman, according to a Shenzhen stock exchange filing. The institute is a research unit of the China Aerospace Science and Technology Corp., a key technology provider to the nation's space and defense programs. The firm became the earliest investor in ZTE when then-employee Hou Weigui decided to set up a telecommunications equipment company in Shenzhen in 1985.

ZTE, which became a focal point of a U.S.-China trade dispute, also said its former board of 14 resigned as it elected a new board of eight. The company had appointed Tian Dongfang, a former chief of the same institute, as party secretary, Bloomberg News reported last month.

New leadership was one of several conditions in an agreement struck between ZTE and the U.S. to end a seven-year ban on technology purchases that crippled its business. The Chinese company also agreed to pay a

steep fine for violating sanctions on exports to Iran and North Korea, then lying about it. ZTE's lost almost \$11 billion of market value since its shares resumed trading on June 13.

Its new management now faces the challenge of rebuilding trust with phone companies and corporate customers. And its settlement with the Commerce Department remains in doubt. It's been unable to ramp up its factories because lawmakers dispute the agreement and are negotiating a bill with the White House that may effectively reinstate the ban.

"Even if ZTE manages to return to normal operations, ZTE still needs to face headwinds from rebuilding the company's branding, losing customers, the restructuring change in management team and the introduction of U.S. compliance team," Guotai Junan Securities analyst Ricky Lai wrote in a memo ahead of the shareholders meeting.

The company is said to be facing at least \$3 billion in total losses from the months-long moratorium, which cut off the flow of chips and other components it needed to make its networking gear and smartphones.

Read more: ZTE Faces Tougher Challenges After U.S. Fine

— With assistance by Yuan Gao, Lulu Shen, and Steven Pu

A Massive Cache Of Law Enforcement Personnel Data Has Leaked

[ZDNet](#), June 29, 2018

A data breach at a federally funded active shooter training center has exposed the personal data of thousands of US law enforcement officials, ZDNet has learned.

The cache of data contained identifiable information on local and state police officers, and federal agents, who sought out or underwent active shooter response training in the past few years. The backend database powers the website of Advanced Law Enforcement Rapid Response Training – known as ALERRT – at Texas State University.

The database dates back to April 2017 and was uploaded a year later to a web server, believed to be owned by the organization, with no password protection.

ZDNet obtained a copy of the database, which was first found by a New Zealand-based data breach hunter, who goes by the pseudonym Flash Gordon.

Working with federal agencies like the FBI, the Texas-based organization provides training to law enforcement and civilians around the US in an effort to prevent or disrupt active shooter incidents. Since its inception in 2002, ALERRT has received tens of millions

of dollars in funding from the Justice Department, Homeland Security, and several state governments.

It's said that more than 114,000 law enforcement officials have been trained by ALERRT.

When reached, ALERRT's executive director, Pete Blair, declined to comment. When asked if the breach will be reported to state authorities, Blair said: "We always follow all state laws."

A spokesperson for Homeland Security referred comment to ALERRT. When reached prior to publication, the FBI said it had no comment.

"In the wrong hands this data could be detrimental or even deadly for the first responders who put their lives on the line every day," said John Wethington, a security researcher, who reviewed a portion of the data for ZDNet.

The database contained thousands of personal data records, including law enforcement officer's work contact information, with many of the records listing personal email addresses, work addresses, and cell numbers.

Officials from the FBI, Customs and Border Protection (CBP), and the US Border Patrol were listed in the database.

In another table, some 65,000 officers who had taken an ALERRT course and provided feedback had their full name and zip code exposed.

Another table listed detailed histories on instructors, including their skills and training, while another contained the names of more than 17,000 instructors.

Another table contained 51,345 sets of geolocation coordinates of schools, courts, police departments, and government buildings, like city halls and administrative offices. The data also included places of interest, such as where people gather – like universities and malls. The list also contained, in some cases, police officers' home addresses. We confirmed this using Google's Street View, which in several cases revealed marked police vehicles outside the residence.

It's not clear for what reason these locations were collated or stored.

A map made up of the geolocation data found in the database. (Image: ZDNet).

The organization also kept more than 85,000 emails that were sent by staff to prospective trainees and course takers dating back to at least 2011. Responses and replies sent by law enforcement did not appear in this table.

Many of the emails contained or asked for sensitive data. Password reset emails would often ask users for their date of birth or the last four digits of their Social Security number for their profile. It's not clear why

this data was needed, or if it was stored in another database.

Other emails informed law enforcement staff of successful enrollment in classes, which contained names, email addresses, phone numbers, the course they were taking, and where and when the course was offered.

That data alone would give anyone insight into the capabilities of police and law enforcement departments across the country.

Read also: Trump administration: We'll let AI 'freely develop' in US – TechRepublic

Wethington told ZDNet that this data, combined with other readily available information on the internet, "could be used to target individuals or groups of first responders and their families."

But other tables included requests made by law enforcement reaching out to the organization for help through its web form. In doing so, many officials volunteered highly sensitive information about deficiencies in their jurisdiction, revealing their department's lack of training or capabilities.

One police department openly admitted that it "doesn't have a full-time SWAT team," and is unable to respond to an active shooter situation. An ALERRT staffer responded, saying that the organization "couldn't facilitate his request at this time."

Another had a similar situation. "Multiple agencies often respond to high priority calls together, yet rarely train together," said one police chief who was requesting anti-shooter training.

In another case, a police sergeant based in a rural town on the east coast requested training, describing the majority of its residents as firearm owners, but any shooter response team would be more than a half-hour away.

In another case, one university police lieutenant requested training for his department. He said that there was "no active shooter response instructor training [in the area] in the last five years."

"The information disclosed in some of these messages paints a picture of a nationwide lack of training and a system that is unable to sustain the influx of requests," said Wethington.

Read also: US government takes on botnets and other automated attacks

"This intelligence could be easily exploited by domestic terrorists or 'lone wolfs' to exploit the weaknesses discussed in this correspondence," he said. "For instance, an individual who wanted to push a particular state or local agency and the community it supports into a crisis need only look for an agency or

community in this data that has expressed concern for their ability to respond to a active shooter.”

The database has since been removed, but it's not known who else accessed it or what damage may have already been done.

Got a tip?

You can send tips securely over Signal and WhatsApp at 646-755-8849. You can also send PGP email with the fingerprint: 4D0E 92F2 E36A EC51 DAAE 5D97 CB8C 15FA EB6C EEA5.

[Read More](#)

U.S. Law Enforcement Training Center Data Breach ‘Exposes Cops, FBI Agents’

By Jason Murdock

[Newsweek](#), June 29, 2018

A database containing the personal details of thousands of U.S. law enforcement officers linked to a Texas State University-based training center known as ALERRT was leaked online.

The data, which dates back to mid-2017, contained email addresses, work addresses and phone numbers of police and federal agents, ZDNet reported Friday. The publication, which obtained the cache from a security researcher using the pseudonym “Flash Gordon, said that staff from three major agencies—FBI, Customs and Border Protection (CBP) and US Border Patrol—were impacted.

ALERRT, or Advanced Law Enforcement Rapid Response Training, teaches how to deal with active shooter situations. It was created in 2002 in partnership between Texas State University, the Texas Police Department and Hays County Sheriff's Office. More than 85,000 law enforcement officers across the U.S. have reportedly been trained in its FBI-certified operations and tactical programs.

The leaked information, which ZDNet reported was left online without password protection, also included emails about enrollment classes and complaints about a lack of departmental resources. One database table allegedly contained identifying information for more than 17,000 course instructors.

The spokesperson for ALERRT did not immediately respond to a request for comment.

The exposure of U.S. law enforcement data led to fears that officers could be identified and targeted, however there is no evidence this has occurred. The database has now been secured.

It is not the first time that sensitive police data has been the subject of controversy. In 2016, files belonging to the Fraternal Order of Police (FOP), a union with approximately 330,000 members, was leaked onto the

internet by a hacker. The 2.5GB trove included chats from an online forum that were critical of president Barack Obama and illegal immigrants, The Guardian reported at the time.

In July the same year, a security researcher found a terrorism database used by police departments and intelligence agencies—known as World Check—had been online without password protection.

The database, which is managed by Thomson Reuters and designed to house profiles on suspected terrorists and shady individuals linked to organized crime, included more than 2.2 million records. The blacklist was later listed for sale on the dark web for 10 bitcoin, which was \$6,600 at the time.

Since launching, ALERRT has reportedly been granted more than \$50 million in state and federal grant funding. According to the organization's website, its training courses are delivered by veteran law enforcement SWAT specialists with real proven experience in active shooter response situations.

Data Breach Exposes Details Of FBI, Customs And Border Agents: Report

By Andrew Blake

[Washington Times](#), June 29, 2018

Federal agents employed by the FBI and the Department of Homeland Security are among thousands of U.S. law enforcement officials affected by a data breach reported Friday involving the Advanced Law Enforcement Rapid Response Training, or ALERRT, a federally-funded active-shooter training center at Texas State University.

A database containing the details of officers who sought or underwent active-shooter response training at the center was recently discovered on a publicly accessible web server lacking password protection, ZDnet reported Friday.

The database has since been taken offline, but not without first being accessed by a pseudonymous cybersecurity researcher known as Flash Gordon and given to ZDNet, the report said. Others may have accessed the server as well, however, potentially putting thousands of police officers at risk.

Among the data found on the exposed server was a table listing the full names and zip codes of some 65,000 officers who had taken an ALERRT course and provided feedback, ZDnet reported. Other leaked data included information on over 17,000 course instructors, more than 85,000 outgoing emails and law enforcement officers' contact information including personal email addresses and cellphone numbers, the report said.

The exposed database was created in April 2017 and contains information concerning local, state and federal officers, including agents from the FBI and at least two division of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security: Customs and Border Protection (CBP) and the U.S. Border Patrol, the report said.

Neither the FBI, DHS nor ALERRT's executive director, Pete Blair, commented on the breach when contacted, ZDNet reported.

"We always follow all state laws," Mr. Blair responded when asked if he'd report a potential breach to authorities.

Personally identifiable information risks being leveraged by criminals, including identity thieves and extremists, and federal agents have previously had their names appear on "hit lists" circulated by supporters of the Islamic State terrorist group after being leaked online.

"In the wrong hands this data could be detrimental or even deadly for the first responders who put their lives on the line every day," said John Wethington, a security researcher who examined some of the data for ZDNet.

Along with open source intelligence, the data "could be used to target individuals or groups of first responders and their families," the researcher added.

President Trump said at a rally Wednesday that federal law enforcement officials are "under attack," citing recent criticism directed toward U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) and his administration's "zero tolerance" policies at the southern border.

"Democrats are now launching vicious smears against our incredible ICE officers and our Border Patrol agents," Mr. Trump said during the event in Fargo, North Dakota. "Left-wing activists are trying to block ICE officers from doing their jobs and publicly posting their home addresses, putting these incredible people and their families in harm's way.

"These radical Democrat protesters, they really want anarchy, but the only response they will find from our government is very strong law and order," he said.

Copyright © 2018 The Washington Times, LLC.
Click here for reprint permission.

Homeland Security Subpoenas Twitter For Data Breach Finder's Account

[ZDNet](#), July 1, 2018

Homeland Security has served Twitter with a subpoena, demanding the account information of a data breach finder, credited with finding several large caches of exposed and leaking data.

The New Zealand national, whose name isn't known but goes by the handle Flash Gordon, revealed the subpoena in a tweet last month.

The pseudonymous data breach finder regularly tweets about leaked data, found on exposed and unprotected servers. Last year, he found an trove of almost a million patients' data leaking from a medical telemarketing firm. A recent find included an exposed cache of law enforcement data by ALERRT, a Texas State University-based organization, which trains police and civilians against active shooters. The database, secured in March but reported last week, revealed that several police departments were under-resourced and unable to respond to active shooter situations.

Homeland Security's export control agency, Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), served the subpoena to Twitter on April 24, demanding information about the data breach finder's account.

Twitter informed him of the subpoena, per its policy on disclosing legal processes to its users. A legal effort to challenge the subpoena by a June 20 deadline was unsuccessful.

Attorneys from the Electronic Frontier Foundation provided Flash Gordon legal assistance.

ICE demanded Twitter turn over his screen name, address, phone number – and any other identifying information about the account, including credit cards on the account. The subpoena also demanded the account's IP address history, member lists, and any complaints filed against the Twitter account.

The subpoena did not demand the account's private messages or any other content, which typically requires a court order or a search warrant.

It's not known why the subpoena was issued. Twitter spokesperson Emily Horne said the company does not comment on individual accounts for privacy and security reasons.

ICE export enforcement subpoena. (Image: supplied)

ICE has faced calls for it to shut down amid bipartisan pressure – and complaints from within the agency – over the recent incarcerations of child migrants and lawful asylum seekers. Although ICE's public image is often viewed through a lens of detentions and deportations, a large part of the agency's work includes fighting national security threats and fighting transnational crime, including prosecuting against those who violate export laws.

In a message, Flash Gordon said he believed that the subpoena may have related to the recent find of law enforcement data, but couldn't be sure.

"I don't know what else [Homeland Security] would want from me," he said.

But serving an export enforcement subpoena – used in cases to investigate US export law violations – is almost unheard of in the case of a data breach involving private and personal information, according to one export controls attorney.

“As a general matter, the subpoena is likely to relate to the development or production of a controlled item, and not names, addresses, and contact information,” said the attorney in a phone call, who asked not to be named to avoid any conflicts with his work.

The attorney said that if the subpoena related to the ALERRT breach that this would be “a misuse” of the subpoena power, as the exposed personal data wouldn’t be an export control matter. He said that an export enforcement subpoena may relate to the posting of materials subject to export controls, such as military items, or technical information and schematics.

A search of Flash Gordon’s several hundred tweets revealed nothing obvious that would justify the kind of subpoena served.

The attorney said it’s “not clear how a Twitter account could even be relevant in an export control investigation,” calling the case a “head scratcher.”

The data breach finder said he’s been left without answers, and not knowing which offending tweets – if any – led to the legal process. As we covered last year, several prominent security researchers and data breach hunters spoke of a “chilling effect” of their work.

“Which sucks,” he said in a message, “because now I don’t know what I am allowed to post or talk about on Twitter.”

When reached, ICE spokesperson Matthew Bourke would not comment.

Russian Hacking Could Affect U.S. Agriculture Systems, Says Auburn Professor

By Stephen Lanzi

[Auburn \(AL\) Plainsman](#), June 30, 2018

An Auburn University professor is voicing concern over the potential dangers that state-sponsored Russian hacking poses to U.S. infrastructure, specifically agriculture and water supplies.

Amidst an abundance of Russian-related political controversy, Bob Norton, chair of the Auburn University Food System Institute’s Food and Water Defense Working Group, urges people to be aware of the real, tangible consequences that cyber warfare could have on everyday people.

Norton’s worries stem from the possibilities that hacking from foreign entities could, in a complex

process, harm multiple critical infrastructures due to their interconnectivity. He described critical infrastructures as systems required to make a society survive and flourish, so it would include things like the food, water and electricity systems.

The food and agriculture sector is one of 16 critical infrastructures identified by the Department of Homeland Security.

“What we are concerned about is what are called cascading effects,” Norton said. “Cascading effects are where, for instance, one critical infrastructure is targeted, and then it causes a series of events that some of which may be anticipated and some of which may not, and it starts to affect other critical infrastructures.”

For example, Norton explained how a disturbance in Alabama’s power grid could compromise the \$4 billion poultry industry, which is one of the largest industries in Alabama. This would have a devastating effect on the economy as well as people’s livelihood.

“Cascading effect would be where an adversary like Russia would affect the power grid, which could in turn affect the water supply, which could in turn affect agriculture or the poultry industry itself. Or it doesn’t have to go that far a route. It could go directly from the power supply into the poultry industry.”

Traditionally, agro-terrorism has dealt with inflicting dangerous pathogens on plants or animals that could have a widespread effect, such as the anthrax attacks in 2001. But, Norton said the definition is beginning to expand to include cyber-related attacks on agriculture.

“The whole idea of vigilance is extremely important,” Norton said. “This is not a problem that is just going to go away, so we’re going to be fighting these battles for a very, very long time.”

Norton is a longtime consultant to the U.S. military and federal and state law enforcement agencies. He is also the editor of Bob Norton’s Food Defense Blog.

The Department of Homeland Security, FBI and the United Kingdom’s National Security Center released a joint technical alert in April about malicious cyber activity committed by the Russian government, including threats to residential routers.

An additional technical alert was issued in May, which explained how over 500,000 internet-connected routers in 54 nations had been compromised by Russian activity. It was believed that this information was going to be used against Ukraine, but the intent of the Russians is still somewhat unknown.

“It’s not an unprecedented press release,” Norton said. “Our government has, on occasion, exposed some of these foreign operations that are taking place. But in this particular case, it was the UK and the United States

that jointly released this information, and that is quite unusual, and it really speaks to the level of concern.”

Norton added that Russia is not the only country of concern and not necessarily the most substantial. There are four foreign adversaries that the U.S. is concerned about: Russia, China, Iran and North Korea.

Although there are multiple concerns being juggled, Norton said he is currently focusing on Russia because the government is looking to bring more attention to Russia following the press release.

“One, Russia is a highly sophisticated adversary, and two, they are regularly trying to penetrate into the critical infrastructures, and our relationship with Russia is not good,” Norton said. “Therefore, we’re hoping that it is not going to escalate into something that is not akin to something like a Cold War relationship. We just don’t know what the future will bring.”

The level of concern has exponentially increased among businesses, not just by the government, Norton said. He added that at one time, cyber attacks were just considered a cost of doing business, but it is now considered a deep threat.

Because of the increase in concern and aggressive response from the United States, Norton feels that within the next few years, the government will authorize corporations to strike back.

“Cyber security has now become an existential threat,” Norton said. “It’s not the price of doing business anymore. You can have a company destroyed through the cyber realm. If Russia were to decide to take down a company, it could be extremely costly. Corporations are really starting to push back and ask when can they strike.”

Norton addressed the rise in attention in the media and the increasingly hostile remarks from politicians toward Russia. He does not think the government’s approach has drastically shifted, but the openness to which the government approaches the issue has increased.

“In my estimation, it’s better to let the public know that these things are happening and to be very vocal about it, inform the public,” Norton said. “I think that’s a real positive that we’re seeing in the past couple years.”

With \$1 Million Grant, Howard Looks To Help Fix Cybersecurity Concerns

By Sarah Larimer

[Washington Post](#), June 29, 2018

A \$1 million grant will fund a research project at Howard University aimed at addressing cybersecurity concerns, the university said this week.

There is a national security need for protecting what are known as “cyber-physical systems,” said Moses Garuba, an associate dean at Howard. That means systems connected by networks and also integrated with what Garuba calls “physical processes.”

Think of a manufacturing plant that is making a chemical product, Garuba said Friday. That needs to be monitored by sensors, and when something goes wrong, that information feeds back to a system that is supposed to respond to the issue. Other “cyber-physical systems” can include drones, driverless cars or machines in hospitals, Garuba said.

“These systems are increasing dramatically across the nation, and it’s going to pose a major security threat in terms of hacking if we don’t figure out ways to control them — to understand who is trying to get into them, to monitor these activities as well as to protect them from incursions,” he said.

The three-year grant is from the National Science Foundation, according to the university. It was awarded to Garuba and Danda B. Rawat, an associate professor at Howard. The project will focus on creating a platform to develop and test solutions that would prevent cyber-physical systems from being compromised, Garuba said.

“Part of this research is to encourage the development of security from the onset, not at the tail end of it,” Garuba said. “The systems have to be developed, designed with security in mind and security incorporated.”

Howard, in Northwest Washington, is a historically black university, and Garuba said he hoped the project would improve minority representation in cybersecurity. The university hopes to attract doctoral candidates to engage in cybersecurity research, Garuba said, and mentor and train leaders in the field.

“This project will enable us to attract more PhD students, doctoral students, who engage in very high-impact research, and then graduate much more of them,” Garuba said. “And that will also help the national goal, the national objective, of increasing, broadly, cyber-experts in the country.”

How Your Smart Fridge Might Be Mining Bitcoin For Criminals

By Robert Stevens

[Associated Press](#), June 29, 2018

Is the web browser on your phone slower than usual? It could be mining bitcoin for criminals.

As the popularity of virtual currencies has grown, hackers are focusing on a new type of heist: putting malicious software on peoples’ handsets, TVs and smart fridges that makes them mine for digital money.

So-called “crypto-jacking” attacks have become a growing problem in the cybersecurity industry, affecting both consumers and organizations. Depending on the severity of the attack, victims may notice only a slight drop in processing power, often not enough for them to think it's a hacking attack. But that can add up to a lot of processing power over a period of months or if, say, a business's entire network of computers is affected.

“We saw organizations whose monthly electricity bill was increased by hundreds of thousands of dollars,” said Maya Horowitz, Threat Intelligence Group Manager for Checkpoint, a cybersecurity company.

Hackers try to use victims' processing power because that is what's needed to create — or “mine” — virtual currencies. In virtual currency mining, computers are used to make the complex calculations that verify a running ledger of all the transactions in virtual currencies around the world.

Crypto-jacking is not done only by installing malicious software. It can also be done through a web browser. The victim visits a site, which latches onto the victim's computer processing power to mine digital currencies as long as they are on the site. When the victim switches, the mining ends. Some websites, including Salon.com, have tried to do it legitimately and been transparent about it. For three months this year, Salon.com removed ads from its sites in exchange for users allowing them to mine virtual currencies.

Industry experts first noted crypto-jacking as a threat in 2017, when virtual currency prices were skyrocketing to record highs.

The price of bitcoin, the most widely known virtual currency, jumped six-fold from September to almost \$20,000 in December before falling back down to under \$10,000.

The number of crypto-jacking cases soared from 146,704 worldwide in September to 22.4 million in December, according to anti-virus developer Avast. It has only continued to increase, to 93 million in May, it says.

The first big case emerged in September and centered on Coinhive, a legitimate business that let website owners make money by allowing customers to mine virtual currency instead of relying on advertising revenue. Hackers quickly began to use the service to infect vulnerable sites with miners, most notably YouTube and nearly 50,000 Wordpress websites, according to research conducted by Troy Mursch, a researcher on crypto-jacking.

Mursch says Monero is the most popular virtual currency among cyber-criminals. A report by cybersecurity company Palo Alto Networks estimates that over 5 percent of Monero was mined through crypto-

jacking. That is worth almost \$150 million dollars and doesn't count mining that occurs through browsers.

In the majority of attacks, hackers infect as many devices as possible, a method experts call “spray and pray.”

“Basically, everyone with a (computer processing unit) can be targeted by crypto-jacking,” said Ismail Belkacim, a developer of an application that prevents websites from mining virtual currencies.

As a result, some hackers target organizations with large computing power. In what they believe might be the biggest crypto-jacking attack so far, Checkpoint discovered in February that a hacker had been exploiting a vulnerability in a server that over several months generated over \$3 million in Monero.

Crypto-jackers have also recently targeted organizations that use cloud-based services, in which a network of servers is used to process and store data, providing more computing power to companies who haven't invested in extra hardware.

Abusing this service, crypto-jackers use as much power as the cloud will allow them to, maximizing their gains. For businesses, this results in slower performance and higher energy bills.

Martin Hron, a security researcher at Avast, says that besides the rise in interest in virtual currencies, there are two main reasons for the rise in attacks.

First, crypto-jacking scripts require little skill to implement. Ready-made computer code that automates crypto-mining is easy to find with a Google search, along with tips on the vulnerabilities of devices.

Second, crypto-jacking is harder to detect and is more anonymous than other hacks. Unlike ransomware, in which victims have to transfer money to regain access to their computers blocked by hackers, a victim of crypto-jacking might never know their computer is being used to mine currency. And as currency generated by crypto-jacking goes straight into a hacker's encrypted wallet, the cyber-criminal leaves less of a trail.

Both Apple and Google have started to ban applications that mine virtual currencies on their devices. But Hron, the Avast researcher, warns that the risk is growing as more everyday devices are connected to the internet — from ovens to home lighting systems — and that these are often the least secure. Hron said that cheaply made Chinese devices were particularly easy to hack.

Some experts say new techniques like artificial intelligence can help get a faster response to suspicious software.

That's what Texthelp, an education technology company, used when it was infected with a crypto-jacker, said Martin McKay, the company's chief technology

officer. "The risk was mitigated for all customers within a period of four hours."

But security researcher Mursch says that these precautions won't be enough.

"They might reduce the impact," he says, "But I don't think we're going to stop it."

Copyright 2018 Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten, or redistributed.

Cyber Spy Agency Gets Statutory Powers

[Daily Mail \(UK\)](#), July 1, 2018

The Australian Signals Directorate has become a statutory authority affirming its capabilities as the nation's leading cyber crime and espionage agency.

The ASD was given power to prevent and disrupt crime, including drug trafficking and child exploitation, being committed outside Australia by electronic means from July 1.

The directorate will now be lead by its first Director General, Mike Burgess, who will report directly to the Minister for Defence Marise Payne.

The agency will retain its primary functions of countering cyber-espionage and defending against cyber threats from foreign states and criminals Ms Payne said on Sunday.

"At the same time, ASD's focus will now expand to lead cyber security support and services to industry, government and the community," she said.

The Australian Cyber Security Centre will now operate under the ASD authority in a bid to carry out this goal.

Mr Burgess said the change in structure would allow the ASD to attract, train and retain talented staff which were being poached by the private sector.

"This will allow ASD to efficiently deliver unique intelligence, leading cyber security advice and assistance, and effects at scale; in support of military operations, countering terrorism and offshore serious cyber-enabled crime," he said in his introductory statement on the ASD's website.

The change was a key recommendation from the 2017 Independent Intelligence Review.

Adidas Hack: 'Millions' Of U.S. Website Customers Warned Of Cyber Theft

By Jason Murdock

[Newsweek](#), June 29, 2018

The website of sporting brand Adidas may have been hacked. The company admitted late on Thursday that millions of usernames and encrypted passwords were probably stolen.

The company said in a brief statement it became aware of the "potential data security incident" on June 26 after a hacker claimed to have "acquired limited data associated with certain Adidas consumers." It stressed there was "no reason to believe" that credit card details had been exploited.

"Adidas is committed to the privacy and security of its consumers' personal data," the release read. "Adidas immediately began taking steps to determine the scope of the issue and to alert relevant consumers. Adidas is working with leading data security firms and law enforcement authorities to investigate the issue." It will alert victims while conducting a forensic review, the brand added.

The preliminary investigation suggests that the breadth of the data leak could be significant. "We are alerting certain consumers who purchased on [adidas.com/US](#) about a potential data security incident," an Adidas spokesperson told Newsweek, adding: "At this time this is a few million consumers."

But much remains unknown about the cyber theft, including a timescale of when the suspected hack took place, what techniques the culprit used to access data and exactly how many details were stolen.

Adidas declined to comment when asked about the specific issues.

The news comes following a cyberattack at Ticketmaster that exposed the personal information of up to 40,000 of its online U.K. customers. The company said that it found "malicious software" on a customer support product hosted by Inbenta Technologies on June 23. Details stolen included names, addresses, email addresses, telephone numbers, payment details and login credentials.

In March, sporting brand Under Armour revealed that it had discovered a "security issue" affecting approximately 150 million user accounts that were linked to its "MyFitnessPal" app and website. Compromised information, it said, included usernames, email addresses, and hashed passwords.

Incidents of this nature are becoming increasingly common, as hackers exploit outdated software in order to siphon off data that can be sold on in packages on the dark web or used in further attacks.

Adidas did not elaborate on which cybersecurity companies it had drafted in to analyze and fix its computer systems, nor on how long it would take for the forensic analysis to reach its completion.

Following Russian Attacks, Cyber Exercise Focuses On Infrastructure

[MeriTalk](#), June 29, 2018

The latest edition of the Army's annual Cyber X-Games exercise is designed to let Reserve and other cyber warriors team up to train in dealing with real-world situations. It is focused on protecting U.S. infrastructure, an area somewhat outside the norm for the exercises, but one that reflects an emerging potential battleground on the cyber landscape.

The Cyber X-Games, held earlier this month at the University of Texas at San Antonio (UTSA), annually bring together cyber and network operations units from the Reserves and the Air Force, along with ROTC cadets and civilians, and this year focused on critical network infrastructures covering finance, public utilities, and health care, according to an Army release. The emphasis of the X-Games is drawn from the focus of the subsequent Cyber Endeavor conference, also held at UTSA, which each year highlights a critical topic facing the nation.

This year's games come on the heels of a Department of Homeland Security alert issued in March of an ongoing, far-reaching Russian cyber campaign targeting U.S. power grids and other infrastructure, including the water and aviation sectors, critical manufacturing industries including nuclear power plants, and several U.S. government entities. The alert, issued by the FBI and DHS's U.S. Computer Emergency Readiness Team (US-CERT), renewed talk about the importance of a whole-of-nation approach to cybersecurity, which includes the Department of Defense playing a part in protecting infrastructure.

This year's games dealt with protecting elements of infrastructure that may have been new to some of the participants, including industrial control systems (ICS) such as supervisory control and data acquisition (SCADA) systems and other hardware-and-software systems widely used in industrial settings. They can run factory machines and operate the doors in prisons, but are widely—and perhaps most significantly—used in power systems and other utilities. They are also used in applications as varied as water treatment, food production, management of telecommunications, and IT systems.

One participant, Air Force Tech. Sgt. Dana Timmons, said that SCADA was not something he expected to see at a Cyber X-Games, but acknowledged that its role in infrastructure operations makes it important, according to the Army release. "SCADA is a big problem set in the cyber forum now, and the fact that it was addressed at the X-Games to bring awareness is significant," Timmons said.

Putting ICS into a military cyber exercise reflects the reality of evolving threats. "What we as coordinators and collaborators try to [do] is take real world cyber

related events and leverage the information from those events into an exercise," said Lt. Col. Michael Lewis, operations officer for the Army Reserve Cyber Operations Group.

While DoD and every other organization deals daily with the regular onslaught of pings, probes, and intrusions on their networks, officials also have been preparing for the possibility of a major, large-scale attack—what one DoD official called a "terabyte of death"—that could do widespread damage to the country. Infrastructure would be a primary target in such an attack, prompting US-CERT and other organizations to emphasize infrastructure protection. DHS and DoD have discussed plans for a coordinated response to a major attack in a joint paper.

The U.S. Cyber Command, which oversees DoD's offensive and defensive cyber operations, includes protecting U.S. infrastructure within its mandate, although its primary mission is the support and defense of DoD networks. Reserve and National Guard units are among those that could provide support directly to states in an emergency or other circumstance, including protecting the integrity of elections. The House Armed Services subcommittee earlier this year also floated the idea of having DoD set up cyber components that could assist civilian agencies in the event of a major attack.

Cheap Tech And Widespread Internet Access Fuel Rise In Cybersex Trafficking

[NBC News](#), June 30, 2018

MALOLOS, Philippines — Law enforcement officials from three countries weaved down a narrow cement path in a cluster of slums one afternoon in March to descend on a man suspected of streaming live sex acts with children to pedophiles around the world.

Knotted cellphone chargers, cheap webcams, stacks of dusty keyboards and an old computer lay strewn across the bare plywood floor of the man's house, little more than a shack with bare cement walls, two dingy rooms and a crawl space under the rafters of the corrugated tin roof. Philippine police and anti-trafficking agents, backed by agents from the FBI, U.S. Homeland Security, and police from Norway, took the man into custody and rescued five children.

The suspect is just one of thousands of people in the burgeoning industry of online sexual exploitation of children, also known as cybersex trafficking, in which pedophiles outsource rape and sexual abuse to facilitators, who then broadcast their acts on streaming video services to people around the world. The proliferation of cheap internet technology and worldwide

payment systems have made it easy to set up such operations.

"All it takes is a laptop, a webcam, an internet connection and money remittance service so you can get paid," said Ransom Avilla, an attaché at the U.S. Embassy in Manila for Homeland Security Investigations, a branch of Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

Of the children rescued, three — a 9-year-old girl, a 13-year-old boy and a 16-year-old girl — were known victims. Two others, a baby and a 2-year-old boy, were both at risk of being abused.

Advances in technology in the last decade have made smartphones cheaper and given millions of people access to the internet, making it easy to exploit for cybersex trafficking.

The result is a boom in for-profit child abuse. Terre des Hommes, a Dutch organization that specializes in combating online child abuse, estimates that 750,000 people around the world are looking for child pornography in tens of thousands of live chat rooms each day.

Brian Herrick, acting chief of the FBI's section devoted to stopping the exploitation of children online, said that because of the secretive nature of the crime, it is difficult to know exactly how many people are participating, but they can glean some information from arrests. Herrick said the number of individuals arrested on federal sexual abuse charges doubled between 1994 and 1998, again between 1998 and 2004, and a third time between 2004 and 2013. In 2014 there were over 3,400 arrests for federal sexual abuse charges.

Herrick said investigations had found websites with memberships of 30,000 and 150,000 accounts each. The websites required users to share illicit images to keep membership, and in return provided sophisticated technical cover against identification, such as encrypted web services that can make it hard to track criminals on the internet. Two separate arrests in 2016 involved men who ran sites on the Tor network, which can obscure users' identities.

The distributed nature of these systems — facilitators develop relationships with men in different countries — also poses a challenge. The multinational group of law enforcement that descended on the Philippines highlights how one case can be of interest to multiple countries, with the man arrested accused of having clients in multiple countries, including the U.S. and Norway.

And as child sexual abuse moved online, individual abusers exhibited increasingly disturbing behavior. According to an estimate by the United Nations Office of Drugs and Crime, before the internet, a collection of 150

photographs would be considered large for a pedophile. Since internet access has improved, pedophiles now regularly have collections of over 150,000 images, in addition to live, made-to-order sex shows.

Online sexual exploitation has distinguished itself from the more traditional form of in-person pedophilia by involving ever-younger victims. Fifty-six percent of victims are pre-pubescent, and enforcement officers have reported rescuing victims as young as 18 months. A report this year by Interpol found that the younger the child, the more severe the abuse.

On a given week, Avilla estimates that 60 percent to 70 percent of HSI's criminal investigations of American crime in the Philippines is related to the online sexual exploitation of children.

While many other countries are poor and have increasing access to internet, the Philippines has become a hub for online cybersex trafficking because many Filipinos, even in rural slums, speak English.

The interaction between a pedophile and a facilitator with access to children starts with a chat. Facilitators are sometimes referred by other pedophiles, while other times pedophiles and facilitators find each other in legal sex-chat rooms, building up trust before moving on to private conversations about illegal transactions. Some talks are held in elusive corners of the dark web, but pedophiles are not necessarily the most technologically adept. Often the conversations happen on Skype, Facebook Messenger or another service that can make video calls.

Among the evidence collected from the house in Malolos were two basic phones, eight low-end smartphones, three laptops, several webcams and a handful of wi-fi connectors, or dongles, as well as evidence of accounts at money-wiring services, which can facilitate international payments.

The low cost of setting up such operations makes child cybersex trafficking easy to operate and difficult to prevent. While there are some websites that orchestrate complex, high-tech networks for sharing images, technology has made it so that people who are poor and willing to engage in illegal acts for money can now speak directly to pedophiles with a criminal desire. For less than \$100 — the price of one cheap smartphone and enough internet credit to stream video — anyone can start an operation.

Sam Inocencio Jr., the Philippines director of the nonprofit organization International Justice Mission, said the online sexual exploitation of children thrives in an environment of impunity. Facilitators and abusers are willing to commit the crime as long as they believe they are not going to get caught.

Each arrest, then, makes abusing children riskier and less profitable, “until you’ve basically destroyed their business model,” Inocencio said. The strategy is to make getting caught more likely and the punishment harsher to deter potential abusers who might be contemplating exploiting nearby children.

Poverty, coercion and individual depravity, among other factors, all play a role in why adults sexually abuse children for money, but Inocencio said policing is the best way to take on the problem.

“If you want to see a quicker, faster way of addressing it,” he said, “it’s effective law enforcement.”

TERRORISM INVESTIGATIONS

N.S.A. Purges Hundreds Of Millions Of Call And Text Records

By Charlie Savage

[New York Times](#), June 29, 2018

WASHINGTON — The National Security Agency has purged hundreds of millions of records logging phone calls and texts that it had gathered from American telecommunications companies since 2015, the agency has disclosed. It had realized that its database was contaminated with some files the agency had no authority to receive.

The agency began destroying the records on May 23, it said in a statement. Officials had discovered “technical irregularities” this year in its collection from phone companies of so-called call record details, or metadata showing who called or texted whom and when, but not what they said.

The agency had collected the data from a system it created under the USA Freedom Act. Congress enacted that law in 2015 to end and replace a once-secret program that had systematically collected Americans’ domestic calling records in bulk. The National Security Agency uses the data to analyze social links between people in a hunt for hidden associates of known terrorism suspects.

The program traces back to a component of the once-secret Stellarwind surveillance program that the Bush administration put in place after the Sept. 11, 2001, attacks. The data collection eventually came to be justified under disputed interpretation of a law known as Section 215 of the Patriot Act and was exposed in 2013 in the leaks by Edward J. Snowden, the former intelligence contractor.

The disclosure caused an uproar, and Congress eventually enacted the Freedom Act to end and replace the program. Under the new system, the bulk data about Americans’ phone calls and texts has instead remained

in the hands of telecoms, and the National Security Agency may collect only specific sets of records from it: the phone logs of a surveillance target and of everyone that person has contacted. A judge must also agree that there is reason to suspect the target has links to terrorism.

Under the Freedom Act, the agency took in 151 million call-detail records in 2016 and 534 million such records in 2017, according to government reports.

David Kris, a founder of the Culper Partners consulting firm who led the Justice Department’s National Security Division in the first term of the Obama administration, called the disclosure “a failure” of the implementation of the USA Freedom Act, which is set to expire next year if Congress does not enact new legislation extending it.

“The fact that they need to purge all of the data they received pursuant to queries over the last three years is evidence of that failure,” said Mr. Kris, adding that the errors illustrated how new problems can sometimes crop up when the government makes systems more complex in an effort to better balance security and privacy.

The National Security Agency did not explain what technical irregularities caused the problem. But an agency spokesman, Chris Augustine, said the problem did not result in any collection of location records from cellphone towers. Under the USA Freedom Act, the agency is not permitted to gather that type of record using its system.

Glenn S. Gerstell, the National Security Agency’s general counsel, said in an interview that because of several complex technical glitches, one or more telecom providers — he declined to say which — had responded to court orders for targets’ records by sending logs to the agency that included both accurate data and also some numbers of people the targets had not been in contact with.

As a result, when the agency then fed those phone numbers back to the telecoms to get the communications logs of all of the people who had been in contact with its targets, the agency also gathered some data of people unconnected to the targets. The National Security Agency had no authority to collect their information.

“If the first information was incorrect, even though on its face it looked like any other number, then when we fed that back out, by definition we’d get records back on the second hop that we did not have authority to collect,” he said.

In a statement, Senator Ron Wyden, Democrat of Oregon, who is on the Senate Intelligence Committee and is often a critic of surveillance programs from a

privacy rights perspective, blamed telecoms — not the government — for the problem.

“Telecom companies hold vast amounts of private data on Americans,” Mr. Wyden said. “This incident shows these companies acted with unacceptable carelessness, and failed to comply with the law when they shared customers’ sensitive data with the government.”

The agency worked with telecommunications companies to figure out the sources of the problem, Mr. Gerstell added, and was satisfied that it was fixed going forward. But because it was deemed infeasible to try to identify and selectively delete the contaminated records in the database, he said, they instead decided to purge all of them.

The National Security Agency said in its statement that it had separately “reviewed and revalidated its intelligence reporting to ensure that the reports were based on properly received” data. Mr. Gerstell said that vetting process had been done manually.

Follow Charlie Savage on Twitter @charlie_savage.

South Florida Man Pleads Guilty To Making Bomb Threats Against Mosque

By Wayne K. Roustan

[South Florida Sun Sentinel](#), June 29, 2018

A South Florida man is guilty of a federal hate crime for phoning in several bomb threats to a mosque in Pembroke Pines, according to the U.S. Attorney’s Office in Miami.

Dustin Allen Hughes, 26, of Cutler Bay, pleaded guilty in federal court Thursday to one count of obstructing the free exercise of religious beliefs through the threatened use of a dangerous weapon and explosive, prosecutors said in a statement.

A federal grand jury indicted Hughes May 24 after he left four curse-filled voicemails, between May 2 and May 5, threatening to detonate a bomb at the Jamaat Ul Mutaqeen Mosque, according to court documents.

The calls were transcribed in the criminal complaint.

“I am so fed up with you Muslims coming here causing mayhem to Americans, so I am gonna give you a taste of what you give to us,” one voicemail said. “I am going to cause you guys to be screaming Allah, Allah, Allah, Allah.”

Each of the voicemails threatened Muslims, said a bomb was planted in the building, and that its detonation was imminent, documents showed.

A thorough sweep was conducted inside and outside the mosque, in the 1000 block of Southwest 196 Avenue, but no explosives were found, police said.

“Freedom of religion is a fundamental right for every American,” said Robert F. Lasky, special agent in charge of the FBI in Miami. “The FBI and its partners will work tirelessly to ensure anyone who threatens those rights is held accountable.”

Hughes faces up to 20 years in prison at his sentencing scheduled for Sept. 6.

The Associated Press contributed to this report.

wkroustan@sunsentinel.com or 954-356-4303 or Twitter @WayneRoustan

‘I am going to cause you guys to be screaming Allah,’ man claimed in threats to mosque, feds say

Man who made bomb threats to Palm Beach County schools sentenced to more than 3 years in prison

Guilty verdict in student’s South Plantation High bomb threat case

Cutler Bay, FL Man Admits Phoning In Bomb Threats To Mosque

By David J. Neal

[Miami Herald](#), June 29, 2018

No surprise that Cutler Bay resident Dustin Hughes pleaded guilty Friday to one count of obstructing the free exercise of religious beliefs through the threatened use of a dangerous weapon and explosive.

After all, Hughes expressed glee at the fear that his May 5 bomb threat caused at the Jamaat Ul Mutaqeen Mosque of Pembroke Pines, Florida, according to the criminal complaint.

“When advised, in substance, that the calls caused the members of the mosque to become scared, Hughes clapped and said something to the effect of ‘good,’ or some other similar words of approval,” the complaint reads. “During the interview, Hughes stated, in substance, that he wanted to scare members of the mosque and upset them.”

This interview followed Pembroke Pines police and the FBI tracking five nasty May 5 phone calls to the mosque back to Hughes via several methods, including the mosque’s digital caller ID saying, “DUSTIN HUGHES.”

On Friday, the Justice Department said, the 26-year-old admitted he called the mosque’s emergency line and left a “hate-filled and profanity-laden” message denigrating Islam and threatening to blow up the mosque.”

Hughes also admitted he mentioned a detonator and he would “blow your temple up” and “you guys are all going to be up in flames after I’m done with you.”

Hughes will be sentenced Sept. 6. For an indication of what kind of sentence awaits Hughes, security guard Gerald Wallace got a year after pleading guilty to the same charge in January. Wallace threatened to shoot members of a Miami Gardens mosque.

Man Admits Making Bomb Threat Targeting Florida Mosque

By Makini Brice

[Reuters](#), June 29, 2018

Full-text stories from Reuters currently cannot be included in this document. You may, however, click the link above to access the story.

Man Charged In Bucks Co. Bomb Probe Out On Bail

[Doylestown-Buckingham-New Britain \(PA\) Patch](#),

June 30, 2018

David Surman Jr., the man charged with possessing a weapon of mass destruction after a raid at his Bucks County property Thursday, is out on bail.

Court documents show Surman, 30, of Milford Township, posted bail Friday. It was set at \$750,000, 10 percent cash. The documents show Surman posted the bail himself, paying \$75,000 cash. His preliminary hearing is scheduled for July 10.

Surman was arraigned Thursday afternoon after local, state and federal authorities conducted a raid of his property in connection with an investigation into 30 unexplained explosions over two and a half months in Upper Bucks County.

In addition to the bomb, which Bucks County District Attorney Matthew Weintraub said was ready to be detonated, other explosive devices and “many, many” chemicals capable of making bombs were located. Items seized during the raids will be sent to the FBI facility in Quantico, Va. to be analyzed, Weintraub said.

Surman is facing four felony counts of possessing/manufacturing weapons of mass destruction, as well as four counts of possession of an instrument of crime and four counts of prohibited offensive weapon, among other charges.

It is not clear what Surman intended to do with the bombs.

In addition to the bombs and chemicals, officials said they located a notebook with odd sketches depicting everything from swastikas to gravestones and cartoon images of bombs going off. You can see images of the sketches in his notebook [here](#).

The mysterious explosions, which were mostly heard during the overnight hours, drew the attention of the FBI and the ATF, which aided the Pennsylvania State Police in its investigation.

Weintraub said that Surman was identified as a suspect in the explosions after “around-the-clock” surveillance by investigators. Seven detonation sites were found in close proximity to Surman’s home and business, investigators said.

The Case Of The Purloined Poultry: How ISIS Prosecuted Petty Crime

By Rukmini Callimachi

[New York Times](#), July 1, 2018

The crime scene was Stall No. 200 in a market eight miles north of Mosul, Iraq.

It was there that Zaid Imad Khalaf, 24, made a living selling chickens, scraping by next to a grocer who sold onions by the kilogram and a trader who sold flour by the scoop.

And it was there that an Islamic State soldier, one of the thousands who ruled the plains of northern Iraq, walked by and pointed to Mr. Imad’s plumpest chicken. “That one,” he said.

Mr. Imad butchered the bird, plucked it, weighed it and then asked for the 8,000 dinars he was owed, around \$7. That’s when the problems started. “When he went to pull the money from his pocket he said that he only had 4,000 dinars and said he would pay me the rest tomorrow,” Mr. Imad recalled.

Normally, the story should have ended there, with a poor man being stiffed by a more powerful one.

And yet a week after the incident in 2016, Mr. Imad did something that might seem foolhardy when the rulers of your city have a reputation for unbridled brutality: He lodged a complaint for the missing \$3.50 with the town’s Islamic Police station. The next day, the Islamic State fighter hurried in to pay the amount he owed.

It was a quick, neat and efficient resolution to the pettiest of problems, one which probably would have gone unheeded before the arrival of the militants.

In a terrorist version of the “broken window” school of policing, the Islamic State aggressively prosecuted minor crimes in the communities it took over, winning points with residents who were used to having to pay bribes to secure police help.

Nearly 400 records and investigation files abandoned in one Islamic State police station and provided to The New York Times suggest that local residents turned to the group for help with the most minor problems.

There was the shopkeeper who reported a customer for failing to pay for half a bag of sugar, the homeowner who wanted compensation for a bad painting job and the man upset that an acquaintance had hit him with a shoe.

The documents show that the Islamic State, also known as ISIS, was willing — even eager — to get involved in the messy details of people's day-to-day lives, and conversely that hundreds of people trusted them to fairly resolve their issues, no matter how trivial.

With the Islamic State's territory reduced to a fraction of what it once was, the world's attention has moved on. Yet the records shed light on how the group managed to hold onto so much land in the first place. And with ISIS still in control of approximately 1,000 square miles in Iraq and Syria, they may also offer lessons about the battles ahead.

The records are contained in hundreds of files recovered from a cluster of buildings in the northern Iraqi town of Tel Kaif, which had housed the group's Shorta Islamiya — its Islamic police force. Most of the papers were discovered by Iraqi security forces who liberated the area in early 2017. They in turn handed them over to The New York Times, so that their contents could be shared with the world.

Grocers, convenience store owners and traders who sold their goods on credit turned to the Islamic State government when customers failed to pay. They sought reimbursement for a cow, a bird, meat, wheat, vegetables, an oil change and a heater. One filed a report for the 150 meters of electrical wire he hadn't been compensated for.

Farmers asked for investigations into the crops damaged by livestock. One sought compensation for the watermelons trampled by an errant sheep. Another said his newly planted field had been kicked up by a total of 21 cows. Yet another reported a shepherd who, he said, allowed his flock to graze on his land seven different times. "Each time, I forgive him and he says he won't do it again, and then he does," he lamented in the report.

The records in the ornate folder below detail the case of 30 stolen sheep.

At times, the reports read like the police blotter in any small town. There were car crashes, burglaries, men who threw punches, and cash stolen from one woman's purse after she left it in an unlocked car.

More often than not, the police station fielded neighborhood disputes that were remarkable for their picayune character. Sometimes, they veered into inanity.

One father came to complain that a neighbor's child had kicked his son. (He underlined that the child doing the kicking was bigger than the child being kicked.) Another accused an acquaintance of calling him a

"pimp." Yet another came to file a complaint because he had been called a "shoe."

Justice was swift and efficient, mostly because no one wanted to risk punishment at the hands of the militants. Yet the fact that hundreds of civilians filed complaints, including against ISIS fighters who had wronged them, suggests that at least some Iraqis believed the terrorist group would do right by them.

Even residents who suffered abuses at the hands of the militants gave them points for their policing, saying that for nonreligious disputes, they were not only fair but also willing to wade into problems that might have been brushed off by most authorities.

Would the Iraqi government have pursued the case of a stolen chicken?

"They wouldn't have even heard this complaint because it was only for 4,000," or \$3.50, said Mr. Imad's younger brother, Alosch Imad. "You have to have wasta — a connection to someone," for the police to take your case under consideration, he explained. "As far as justice was concerned," he said, "ISIS was better than the government."

Frustrated at being repeatedly brushed off by the fighter, who surely by now had eaten his plumpest bird, Mr. Imad, the chicken seller, padlocked his stall, changed into fresh clothes and headed to the Islamic State police station on Al Bareed Street.

The procedure for filing a complaint involved several steps, and each step involved its own paperwork, the voluminous remnants of which were found at the old station.

The police station was housed in a square room, 20 feet by 20 feet.

The police chief faced Mr. Imad across a large desk. Under the circling of a Chinese-made plastic fan that sliced the thick air, he heard Mr. Imad's complaint. Then he pulled out a form bearing the terrorist group's name and, in the field labeled "Case Number," jotted down: 329.

Then, in blue ink, he filled in the date — Jan. 22, 2016, Sunday, 10 a.m. — before writing down the details of the claim in neat script: "The complainant (Zaid Imad Khalaf) complains that the respondent (Bariq) owes him (4,000 Iraqi dinars) after selling him a chicken."

Then he pulled out another form, this one a summons. It ordered the ISIS fighter to report to the precinct. "Warning: In the event you do not show up, necessary steps will be taken to punish you," it said. The police chief then dispatched one of his agents on a scooter, Mr. Imad said, to deliver the summons.

The fighter showed up the next day and immediately paid up, according to a receipt (below).

"In the name of Allah, the Most Merciful, the Most Gracious," the statement begins. The police officer then filled in the blanks on the form: "An amount (4,000 IQD) was received from (Bariq Sibhan Younis) to be paid to (Zaid Imad Khalaf)," it said. "Remaining amount is zero."

Both parties signed the form and put their fingerprints on it, dipping their index fingers into bright purple ink, a gesture that aped one of the bureaucratic procedures of the Iraqi government.

To ascertain the authenticity of the documents, The Times showed a cross section of them to six independent analysts who study the Islamic State, including Mara Revkin of Yale University; Aymenn Jawad al-Tamimi of the Middle East Forum; and a team from West Point's Combating Terrorism Center.

One Tel Kaif resident, Abdulwahid Abdalla, described being on the receiving end of a complaint handled by the militants.

Mr. Abdalla said he had owed his cousin about \$145 for the transportation services the cousin provided to help him move some heavy materials. He had managed to pay off half but then stopped making payments because he ran out of money, he said. To his surprise, his cousin lodged a complaint against him.

The Islamic State gave him a deadline. They didn't care if he didn't have the money, he said, and instructed him to sell something to come up with it. So Mr. Abdalla, a carpenter, sold some beams he had been saving for a construction job at a loss.

"For a while, I was angry at my cousin," Mr. Abdalla said, though he acknowledged that if it had not been for the militants, he might never have paid back what he owed.

When the dispute involved one party insulting or harming another, the Islamic State played a role not unlike that of a school principal asking an unruly pupil to apologize.

Case No. 393, for example, involved three shepherds who beat a farmer after he asked them to stop their sheep from trampling his crops. The three signed a statement saying: "I will not attack my Muslim brother Ahmed Mohammed Qadir and I will not swear at him. I will not let my sheep enter lands belonging to Muslims."

And to make sure that the resolution had teeth, there was also an implicit threat: "In the event I do not keep my promise," the form reads, "I expect to face any and all legal sanctions and punishments" — which meant only one thing in ISIS-controlled Iraq.

One of the Islamic State's first priorities when capturing a new area was to win the trust and cooperation of the civilians, whose labor and good will were essential to their state, said Ms. Revkin, the Yale

researcher. Among the ways it did this was by providing swift justice, which is one of the most basic functions of any state — and one that was sorely lacking under Iraq's government.

"ISIS seemed to recognize early on that it could exploit local demands for dignity by listening to people's complaints and problems and offering some fast solutions," said Ms. Revkin, who has interviewed more than 200 people who lived in ISIS-controlled areas.

Now in prison, the "emir" of the police station in the village of Sahaji, which had jurisdiction over an 11-mile stretch northwest of Mosul, confirmed that the militants' goal was to try to win over the population. In a jailhouse interview in northern Iraq, where he spoke with his hands in handcuffs while a guard looked on, he recalled how he had aggressively investigated the case of a shopkeeper who had been owed the equivalent of \$4.25.

"If we succeeded in delivering justice, we knew we would win the hearts of the people," he explained.

As word spread, residents began showing up with complaints about unpaid loans and services dating to well before ISIS came to power. Among them was a complaint for an unpaid bill of \$119 from 2010 — or four years before ISIS planted its flag in Tel Kaif. "He has been asking for his money during that period, but the respondent was stalling and delaying until now," the filing says.

There was also a three-year-old debt of \$340 for electricity, a claim for \$298 for a three-year-old window installation, a three-year-old unpaid meat bill of \$170 and two-year-old claims for \$2,115 for vegetables.

In his store on a ribbon of asphalt not far from the police station, Ahmed Ramzi Salim keeps a register of the money owed to him. Customers regularly asked for credit to buy the eggs he sells from an open tray, the rice and flour he sells by the scoop and a deodorant spray called Fresh Time.

Mr. Salim, a stocky, rosy-faced 26-year-old, said he filed three complaints in the time ISIS ruled the town, one of which was recovered in the files left behind in the police station. Before the militants took over, he recalled, he struggled for over a year to get the \$136 owed him by a butcher who frequented his convenience store. "It was as if I was begging him," he said.

As soon as the Islamic State got involved, the problem disappeared. The man showed up four days later to pay back what was owed.

"It was efficient, because people were afraid of them," Mr. Salim said. "If you hear you've been summoned to the ISIS police station, you'll do everything to avoid that."

"This case was transferred to the court," the police officer scribbled in the margin of Case No. 407, a

complaint lodged by a woman who said her husband had beaten her in public.

While a majority of the cases were settled inside the police station, the records show that those the group deemed to be the most severe were sent to an Islamic tribunal.

The 87 carbon-copied, prison transfer records found in the police station are an archive of religious zeal. Citizens were thrown in jail for shaving their beards and for more obscure transgressions, like eyebrow plucking.

Men were locked up for sitting too close to a woman, for being found alone with a woman, for wearing tight clothes and even for disobeying their parents. Several were charged with mocking or slandering the Islamic State.

And then there was the case of the unfortunate individual named in Prison Transfer Order No. 001646, who was charged with six offenses at once. The form says he was arrested in 2016 for smoking, playing cards, playing dominoes and smoking a hookah, as well as either watching or possessing pornographic videos and songs. (The form fails to clarify if he was doing all of these things at once or if he partook in these assorted activities over a period of time.)

If the ISIS system of justice worked, it was because it was authoritarian. Severe and unyielding, it compelled obedience in ways that an ordinary, law-abiding society cannot.

Allegations of corruption and wrongdoing by the militants are not hard to come by. But harsh and rigid as the Islamic State was, it did provide certain rights to citizens — and they were willing to prosecute their own.

Several of the complaints recovered at the Tel Kaif police station were filed against ISIS members. The most surprising may be Case No. 494, which involved an allegation of torture against a policeman working at the very police station where the grievance was recorded.

According to the complaint, Ihab Mohammed Yasin was hanging out with his friends when a militant accosted the group and wrongly accused them of smuggling cigarettes. “He asked us to take out our cigarettes. I told him that I don’t have any cigarettes. He took us to their station,” the victim wrote, adding, “He hit me in the face and all over my body with a rubber hose.”

The outcome of the case was not recorded in the papers we recovered, but the fact that it was filed at all is telling. “If civilians were universally distrustful and afraid of ISIS authorities, then no one would ever file a complaint against an ISIS member for fear of retaliation,” Ms. Revkin, the Yale researcher, said.

Reading through the records, one has to wonder if at a certain point the Lilliputian character of some of the

cases began trying the patience of even the terrorist group’s appointed administrator as he sat under the lapping blades of the Chinese fan, dispensing justice.

There was Case No. 436, involving a customer who bought half a bag of sugar at a local supermarket, only to try to return it the next day after he found a cheaper distributor.

There was Case No. 499, filed by a man whose neighbor cut the electricity wire running to his house after discovering his cow dead next to a downed line. “Now I don’t have electricity in my house,” the complainant wrote.

Did Case No. 167, filed by an employee of a health clinic, prompt a face-palm from the policeman who recorded it? The summary states that every day on his walk to work, the employee politely greeted a sidewalk cooking-gas vendor. Then one day, everything changed.

“When I was going to work, I said ‘Hi’ to him, and he replied with ‘Hello, thief,’” the complainant wrote. “I told him: ‘Why do you call me a thief? What did I steal from you?’ “ That’s when the vendor started to hit him, the clinic worker claimed.

Or the man in Case No. 430, who had a disagreement with an acquaintance.

“This incident happened 20 days ago,” the victim explained, “and after that incident, every time I pass in front of him, he spits on the ground.”

He sought the help of the world’s most feared terrorist group because of that grave offense.

Like every other complaint, it was neatly filled out, with a date and time, and assigned a case number, before being placed in a plastic sleeve for safekeeping.

Sikhs And Hindus Bear Brunt Of Latest Afghanistan Suicide Attack

By Zabihullah Ghazi And Mujib Mashal

[New York Times](#), July 1, 2018

A suicide bomber struck a crowd of Afghan Sikhs and Hindus arriving to meet with President Ashraf Ghani on Sunday as he visited the eastern city of Jalalabad, an attack that killed at least 19 people and wounded 10 others, officials said.

The explosion occurred well outside the compound where Mr. Ghani was holding meetings. He was not harmed, and continued with his schedule as normal, officials said.

The attack claimed the life of the only Sikh candidate running in elections in the country this year, a further blow to Afghanistan’s once celebrated diversity, which has been badly affected by decades of violence.

The suicide bombing was the second deadly attack in 24 hours in the province surrounding Jalalabad,

known as Nangarhar, where the Islamic State has a foothold and has repeatedly claimed responsibility for urban suicide bombings. Late on Saturday, militants targeted a boys' school in Khogyani district, beheading three workers and setting fire to the school building.

Although no group had claimed responsibility for either attack as of Sunday night, the beheadings in particular bore the hallmarks of Islamic State tactics and came just weeks after the group threatened to attack schools in the area in retaliation for military operations. Attaullah Khogyani, a spokesman for the governor of Nangarhar, said officials suspected that the Islamic State was behind the assault.

Nangarhar lies along the Afghan border with Pakistan, and Islamic State fighters here have continued to pose a threat despite sustained operations from Afghan commandos and American airstrikes. American and Afghan officials have said the militants' territory has shrunk to just a few districts in the country, but the group continues to declare threats and carry out suicide bombings.

Even as the Afghan government and the United States have pushed for peace talks to end the 17-year war with the Taliban, officials remain on alert that the small Islamic State affiliate could play spoiler.

As the Afghan government and the Taliban declared cease-fires last month, the Islamic State claimed deadly attacks in Nangarhar in which members of both the government and the Taliban were killed.

Most of the victims of the suicide bombing in Jalalabad on Sunday — including 17 of those killed — were from the minority Sikh and Hindu religious groups who were coming to see Mr. Ghani, according to Najibullah Kamawal, the provincial director of public health.

Once vibrant minority groups that numbered in the hundreds of thousands across Afghanistan, Hindus and Sikhs suffered have targeted persecution on top of the widespread war that ravaged Afghanistan. Community leaders estimate that only a couple of hundred families remain, with the rest migrating to India or the West over the past four decades.

Among the victims of Sunday's bombing was Avtar Singh Khalsa, the only Sikh candidate running in Afghanistan's parliamentary elections in October. Health officials in Nangarhar confirmed that Mr. Khalsa died in the attack.

His candidacy drew widespread attention across Afghanistan and was celebrated as a sign of the minority group's resilience and dedication to the country despite the harsh times.

Also among the dead was Rawail Singh, who was an active presence in civil society in Kabul. In one of the

last pictures posted on his Facebook page, Mr. Singh is seen painting with his fourth-grade daughter. "My sweet daughter, learning to paint and study in the Afghan National Institute of Music," part of the caption reads.

In the earlier attack on the school in Khogyani district, the assailants beheaded three caretakers at the Malikyar Hotak boys' high school and then set the offices and library on fire, said Mohammed Asif Shinwari, a spokesman for the Nangarhar education department.

Malik Makee, a tribal elder in the district who also runs a pro-government militia, said he and his forces had arrived at the scene after residents asked for help. The three men who were killed were of "older age, like me," he said.

"We sewed their heads back on their bodies before we took them to the hospital and prepared them for funerals," he said.

Last month, the Islamic State affiliate in Afghanistan declared in a statement and in radio broadcasts that it would target schools — particularly those that teach girls — in response to the United States and Afghan military operations.

Days later, three suicide bombers tried to enter the Nangarhar education department in Jalalabad, the province's capital. Ten civilians and one police officer were wounded in that attack, officials said.

"Afghan schools are increasingly at risk on military, ideological and political fault lines, with attacks increasing in eastern Afghanistan," the Norwegian Refugee Council, which runs a program for displaced students at Malikyar Hotak school, said in a statement.

Mr. Makee, the militia commander, said the school that was attacked late Saturday was in an area that is largely controlled by the Taliban.

Government control in Khogyani has largely been restricted to the district center for many years, with the Taliban controlling vast parts of the area.

Last year, as Islamic State fighters were squeezed in neighboring districts, they tried to overrun the Taliban in Khogyani and establish a presence there. But they faced resistance both from the Taliban and the Afghan government.

Suicide Bomber Targets Sikhs, Hindus In Afghanistan; 19 Dead

By Rahim Faiez

[Associated Press](#), July 1, 2018

A suicide bomber targeted a convoy of Sikhs and Hindus on their way to meet Afghanistan's president in the eastern city of Jalalabad on Sunday, killing at least 19 people.

Inamullah Miakhail, spokesman for the provincial hospital in Nangarhar, said that 17 out of 19 dead in the attack are from the minority Sikh and Hindu community.

Miakhail added that at least ten of the 20 wounded were also from the same minority community and are undergoing treatment at a Jalalabad hospital.

Narendr Singh, one of the wounded Sikh from Sunday's attack, told The Associated Press by phone from his hospital bed in Jalalabad that the attack targeted their convoy. He cried on the phone worrying what had happened to his father, Avtar Singh Khalsa, who was also in the convoy.

Miakhail confirmed that Khalsa, a longtime leader of the Sikh community who had planned to run in the parliamentary elections set for October, was killed in the attack.

Attahullah Khogyani, spokesman for the provincial governor, said that a number of shops and vehicles caught fire as result of the attack.

Gen. Ghulam Sanayee Stanekzai, Nangarhar's police chief, said that the attacker targeted the group on its way to the governor's compound. They had planned to meet with President Ashraf Ghani, who was visiting the region on Sunday.

No one immediately claimed responsibility for the attack, but the Taliban and an Islamic State affiliate are active in the province.

Sikhs and Hindus have long suffered widespread discrimination in the conservative Muslim country and been targeted by Islamic extremists. The community numbered more than 80,000 in the 1970s, but today only around 1,000 remain in the country. Under Taliban rule in the late 1990s, they were told to identify themselves by wearing yellow armbands, but the dictate was not wholly enforced. In recent years, large numbers of Sikhs and Hindus have sought asylum in India, which has a Hindu majority and a large Sikh population.

In a separate incident, at least 110 people have been hospitalized after drinking from a river in the northern Parwan province, an official said.

Abdul Khalil Farhangi, the head of the main hospital in Charakar, the provincial capital, said it was not clear what caused them to become ill. The symptoms included vomiting and headaches.

Afghanistan's infrastructure has suffered from decades of war, and many rural communities do not have access to electricity or clean running water.

Copyright 2018 Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten, or redistributed.

Suicide Attack During Ghani Visit Kills Almost 20 In Eastern Afghanistan

By Sayed Salahuddin

[Washington Post](#), July 1, 2018

A suicide attack near a building where President Ashraf Ghani was meeting with locals in eastern Afghanistan killed nearly 20 people on Sunday, officials said.

Most of the victims were members of the Sikh and Hindu minority groups who were on their way to the meeting, residents said.

The meeting was being held in the Nangahar governor's compound in the heart of the province's capital, Jalalabad, which lies near the border with Pakistan.

"We have received 19 bodies and 20 wounded," Najibullah Kamawal, the head of Nangahar public health department, said by phone.

One of the victims was Awtar Singh Khalsa, a Sikh and the only non-Muslim candidate for the October parliamentary elections, a member of the community said.

The Indian Embassy condemned the attack.

"We strongly condemn the heinous and cowardly terrorist attack in Jalalabad today which resulted in the death of 20 innocent Afghans, including 10 members of the Afghan Sikh community and injured more than 20 persons," it said in a statement. India is the birthplace of Hinduism and Sikhism.

It was unclear whether the attack was aimed at Ghani's visit. No group immediately asserted responsibility for it. Both Taliban insurgents and affiliates of the Islamic State militant group are active in the province.

The Islamic State last month carried out two suicide attacks on two gatherings involving civilians, government forces and Taliban fighters who were celebrating a short truce announced by the Ghani administration and the Taliban.

On Saturday night, gunmen beheaded three guards at a school in a district in Nangahar, regarded as a bastion of the Islamic State, officials said Sunday.

Suspicion fell on the group, which had threatened weeks ago to target schools in the province, forcing authorities to close a number of schools. The Islamic State has not commented on the Saturday attack.

Ghani was visiting Nangahar to inaugurate a hospital complex and, earlier in the day, had urged security officials to take immediate steps to suppress insurgents in the province.

The province's governor was quoted in a statement by the presidential palace as saying that he

told Ghani that criminal groups and mafia elements also posed a threat to the area.

Islamist Militants Attack African Military Base In Mali, At Least Six Dead

By Souleymane Ag Anara, Tiemoko Diallo And Adama Diarra

[Reuters](#), June 29, 2018

Full-text stories from Reuters currently cannot be included in this document. You may, however, click the link above to access the story.

3 Killed In Attack On West African Counterterror Force's HQ

By Baba Ahmed

[Associated Press](#), June 29, 2018

BAMAKO, Mali (AP) — A car packed with explosives detonated at the headquarters of a new, five-nation West African counterterror force in Mali, setting off a gun battle that killed two soldiers, a civilian and two attackers, officials told The Associated Press on Friday.

The attack highlighted the brazenness of the extremist threat in a part of the world that made headlines in October with the killing of four U.S. service members in an ambush in neighboring Niger.

Force commander Gen. Didier Dacko confirmed Friday's attack by phone from Niger, saying it began with the car attack. Residents said the blast shook the community of Severe, near the central city of Mopti.

In addition to the deaths two other attackers were captured, G5 Sahel spokesman Abdoul Salam Diagana told the AP. Four soldiers, three suspected attackers and a civilian were wounded, said Dr. Djibril Kassogue with the Severe Hospital. "The lives of those injured are not in danger," he said.

The chairman of the G5 Sahel, Niger President Mahamadou Issoufou, confirmed the death toll of three, including two military and one civilian, along with the eight injured.

In a statement from the G5 Force, Issoufou condemned "this cowardly act by criminal organizations whose aim is to destabilize one of the essential instruments for the stability of our subregion, in this case the Joint Force of the G5 Sahel."

He lauded the effective response of soldiers, and expressed solidarity with the families of the victims.

In the statement, he also reaffirmed "the determination of the G5 Sahel member countries to fight the terrorist forces with firmness in order to restore the usual tranquility and serenity in which the people of the Sahel live."

This is the first time the G5 Sahel headquarters has been targeted. The assault comes shortly before French President Emmanuel Macron and African leaders meet at an African Union summit starting Sunday in Mauritania, with the regional extremist threat on the agenda.

There was no immediate information on the attackers' identity. A number of extremist groups linked to al-Qaida and the Islamic State group are active in Mali, often targeting local security forces and the world's deadliest active U.N. peacekeeping mission. They also have staged high-profile attacks in the capitals of Mali and Burkina Faso, including simultaneous assaults on the French Embassy and army headquarters in Burkina Faso's capital in March.

The 5,000-strong G5 Sahel force launched last year and includes Mali, Burkina Faso, Chad, Niger and Mauritania. It has received millions of dollars in backing from the United States, European Union, Saudi Arabia and others.

The new force joins multiple counterterror efforts in the region including France's largest overseas military operation, Barkhane.

Follow Africa news at https://twitter.com/AP_Africa

Copyright 2018 Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten, or redistributed.

NATIONAL SECURITY NEWS

Iowa's Digital Driver's Licenses, Coming In 2019, Still A Muddle

By William Petroski

[Des Moines \(IA\) Register](#), July 1, 2018

New digital driver's licenses for smartphones are expected to become available to Iowans next year, but lots of questions remain about how they will work.

For starters, law enforcement agencies still don't know exactly how they will use technology to read the mobile licenses when they ask for your identification. In addition, bars, restaurants and retail stores haven't been told how they will check the ages of customers who want to buy alcoholic beverages or tobacco products.

Civil libertarians are concerned that the use of a digital driver's license could implicate privacy rights, including right to be free from unreasonable searches and seizures of one's phone and its contents during traffic stops.

"We don't have a firm position on this topic because we have yet to be presented with a sufficient amount of detail to analyze the proposal in light of the

specific technology intended,” said Mark Stringer, executive director of the American Civil Liberties Union of Iowa.

Mark Lowe, director of the Iowa Department of Transportation, said all those questions and more should be addressed by mid-2019 when Iowa’s digital driver’s licenses should become available to the state’s nearly 2.3 million licensed drivers.

“Our development plan includes a number of use cases for different relying parties like law enforcement and retailers that will involve their direct engagement in the development of their interactions, but we have not reached that point yet. That’s likely why they are not yet certain how they will interact with it — we’re just not there yet,” Lowe told the Register.

However, anyone who voluntarily chooses to load a digital driver’s license onto their smartphone will also be issued a traditional plastic driver’s license as a backup for situations when the mobile license doesn’t work.

“I think that is really the key thing. If all else fails, you still have that” plastic license, Lowe said.

The Iowa DOT announced plans to develop a mobile driver’s license in 2014. Since then a host of other states have begun working on similar technology, as well as several foreign countries, and the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators has been researching the concept as well.

The electronic license is being developed by the DOT in cooperation with IDEMIA, a private vendor that specializes in providing secure and easily authenticated identification credentials. The state transportation agency has conducted internal testing involving about 100 agency employees to see how mobile driver’s license apps would work in the real world, but state officials say the development process is still underway.

Nearly all states, including Iowa, already allow motorists to show electronic proof of insurance during a traffic stop. Rather than digging through your glove compartment for an insurance card, you can simply show the information on a smartphone app.

Sgt. Paul Parizek, a spokesman for the Des Moines Police Department, said his agency hasn’t received any guidance from the DOT yet about how the mobile driver’s license will be implemented. One of his concerns is that a law enforcement officer could be looking at a driver’s phone while a text message pops up on the screen indicating some criminal activity.

“There are a ton of questions,” Parizek said. “Just like all of our policies, this will be designed with the rights of the individual in mind, and what the lawful practices are.”

Stringer, of the ACLU, noted that the U.S. Supreme Court has ruled the Fourth Amendment protects cell phones from warrantless searches. So far his organization’s concerns have not been resolved, but it’s possible that through technological innovation they could be, he said.

Lowe, of the DOT, said his department wants to avoid situations such as the ones envisioned by Parizek.

“The whole point is not what you see. It is the information that is shared securely that is authenticated and verified,” Lowe said. “So it is no different than handing over your plastic license, except you don’t have to carry a plastic license.”

The mobile license concept is expected to function more in the way of electronic payment solutions like Apple or Google pay functions, in which communication between electronic devices in proximity authorizes a secure token that releases specified information to a relying party, Lowe said. He also said one of the DOT’s goals is to avoid additional costs by providing a free application for law enforcement and retailers for basic verification and authentication purposes.

“The nice part about this is that it allows for data minimization — when a business copies a license or scans the bar code on the license, they get all the information that appears on the license. But often they don’t need that — for instance bars and alcohol retailers really only need to verify birth date,” Lowe said.

“Approaching it in this fashion lets us limit the information verified according to the user requesting the information. ...Again this is in development but this is the path we are charting,” Lowe added.

Carrie Harmon, a regional spokeswoman for the Transportation Security Administration, said the federal agency does not currently accept digital driver’s licenses as valid identification at airport checkpoints. However, TSA is working with several states, including Iowa, to ensure all digital driver’s licenses are compliant with the federal REAL ID program, which establishes minimum security standards for license issuance and production.

“When the Department of Homeland Security certifies that a state’s digital licenses meet REAL ID standards, TSA will accept them at the security checkpoint,” Harmon said.

Brenda Neville, president of the Iowa Motor Truck Association, a trucking industry trade group, said the digital driver’s license has only recently become a point of discussion with truckers. But the industry is pretty sophisticated when it comes to technology and is always willing to embrace something that could impact drivers in a positive way, she said.

"Technology has been extremely important in enhancing productivity and the digital drivers licenses would fall into that category," Neville said.

CFATS: What It And Its Renewal Means To Ag Retail

[AgProfessional](#), June 29, 2018

In 2006, the regulatory program Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards (CFATS) was established. CFATS is overseen by the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) aiming to prevent chemicals from being stolen, sabotaged or deliberately released by any bad actor, including terrorists.

CFATS is back in the news because the Congressional authorization for the program is set to expire in January 2019.

"We had annual reauthorization for CFATS until 2014, and then Congress passed a statute that granted a four-year authorization," explains Amy Graydon, Acting Director of the Infrastructure Security Compliance Division which administers the CFATS program. Graydon says the four-year authorization provided stability for industry so businesses in the regulated universe had the necessary time to implement security measures or make necessary capital investments. The Department is working with Congress and stakeholders to ensure that chemical facilities and the American people remain certain that this important national security program does not lapse.

Currently, CFATS covers approximately 3,400 chemical facilities, including Ag retailers. The CFATS regulation lists more than 320 chemical of interest (COI), of which if a facility stores or distributes a COI at or above the threshold quantity and concentration, it is required to report its holdings to CFATS. The list of COIs and their screening threshold quantities is available [here](#).

Due to the nature of the business of ag retail and products that it stores and distributes, retail locations should be aware of two types of threats: cyber and physical. Graydon explains most retailers are tiered in the CFATS program because they are at risk for the chemicals being stolen or diverted and being exploited offsite.

"We want to work with businesses to help prepare them to think two steps ahead," Graydon says. "Retailers should understand that the chemicals they have are vital to the nation's food supply. But they are also attractive to those who seek to do us harm."

As examples, Graydon says retailers should be sure cyber systems that involve their inventory are adequately protected, including CCTV. She also advises for infrastructure risk management, retailers should

install appropriate detection and deterrent measures, such as locks, and make sure they have good inventory control practices.

There is a time extension to comply with the CFATS requirement for most farms that use the COI in preparation for or during the application to crops, feed, and land livestock. However, this time extension does not necessarily apply to Ag retailers. Retailers that have a COI at or above the applicable screening threshold for purposes other than those just described are required to submit information to DHS.

Request a CFATS Presentation to learn about any part of the CFATS regulation from submitting a Top-Screen to editing a security plan: www.dhs.gov/request-cfats-presentation.

Contact the CFATS Help Desk with questions or to begin the process at 866-323-2957 or at csat@hq.dhs.gov.

Learn more about the program at www.dhs.gov/chemicalsecurity

Additionally, DHS is sponsoring three regional events for education and networking. An upcoming event will be held July 19, in Chicago. The East coast event is scheduled for August 2, in Philadelphia.

Trump And The Supreme Court Got It Wrong. The Travel Ban Won't Keep Us Safe

By Jasmine El-Gamal And Susannah Cunningham
[Washington Post](#), June 29, 2018

The Supreme Court upheld President Trump's ban on travel from five mostly Muslim nations this week, finding that the ban had a "legitimate grounding in national security concerns" and was thus constitutional. Trump celebrated by calling opponents of the ban "hysterical."

But the biggest threat to the United States today does not come from immigrants, refugees or the immigration system but from extremists of all races and religions within our own borders. The court's conclusion therefore isn't just wrong or unjust — it is downright dangerous.

What is fundamentally at the heart of both the ban and the court ruling is a tragically outdated understanding of how modern terrorism networks recruit for and implement attacks on U.S. soil.

Whereas the al-Qaeda of the early 2000s once exploited holes in the U.S. immigration system to commit attacks, today's terrorist networks have realized that those loopholes have long since been closed by immense advances in the U.S. vetting and immigration procedures. Al-Qaeda's successors, such as the Islamic State and al-Shabab, now depend heavily on reaching

potential recruits in our own country, and today they target their audiences through online video propaganda and social media. These efforts are not the least bit affected — and therefore cannot be stopped — by the travel ban.

The ban's focus on Muslim-majority countries is also woefully out of touch with the terrorist threat to the United States. The predominant content of terrorist recruitment videos isn't religious verse because recruits for terrorist networks aren't the faithful. Our partners at the University of Chicago's Project on Security and Threats released a report in 2017 that catalogued 112 individuals indicted on charges of Islamic State-related offenses by the Department of Justice between 2012 and 2014. They found that a majority of the individuals indicted were in fact not pious or born into Muslim families before being recruited but were radicalized through videos centering on a specific narrative: that the United States as a nation is and will forever be an irretrievably racist, unjust and unwelcoming place for minorities. As proof, the militant group's videos point to long-standing violent racist groups such as the Ku Klux Klan and the country's history of prejudice against Catholics, Jews, African Americans and, now, Muslims.

To put it another way, modern terrorist recruitment networks no longer hate us because we're free, they hate us — in part — because many Americans are not free. By engaging in the demonization and "othering" of Muslims and implementing the president's anti-Muslim campaign pledges, this travel ban mimics the Islamic State's depiction of the United States as selectively hostile to people of Muslim faith and bolsters their recruitment efforts. All this under the banner of protecting U.S. national security.

The court had ample time and resources to discover what most veteran national security leaders already know: The travel ban, as described by former National Security Agency and CIA director Michael Hayden, is "unwarranted, it was unnecessary, and it was dangerous." Speaking alongside Hayden at an event in April sponsored by our organization, Only Through US, former defense secretary Chuck Hagel agreed that the process was deeply flawed and that "the facts just don't bear out that immigrants are wreaking havoc and terror on Americans since 2001 ... by any metric or any standard of application that you'd apply to this issue."

It is telling that 52 former national security leaders — including five former CIA directors, two former defense secretaries, two secretaries of state and several other senior officials charged with keeping Americans safe over the last three administrations — wrote a letter to the court outlining the false national security claim to the travel ban. The leaders described that the travel

bans 1.0, 2.0 and 3.0 did not emerge from a careful interagency review by national security and foreign policy offices, and that the third ban "so closely mirror[ed] the original ban in form and substance that any additional 'process' the Government now cites cannot dispel this original sin [of the first]."

Some of the brief's authors were current on active intelligence regarding credible terrorist threat streams directed against the United States as recently as one week before the issuance of the original Jan. 27, 2017, executive order. By contrast, the sole amicus brief by national security figures in support of the ban included a paltry six names, such as Frank Gaffney Jr., the founder and president of the Center for Security Policy (listed by the Southern Poverty Law Center as an anti-Muslim extremist group), but not a single Cabinet-level official.

The majority's opinion agreed that the administration had engaged in a serious interagency review of risks posed by outside countries to the United States — although those results have never been made public. However, as the dissent noted, it is utterly irresponsible to consider any version of the travel ban without placing it within the context of candidate Donald Trump's campaign promise to institute "a complete and total shutdown of Muslims entering our country," his assertion that "Islam hates us" and his moves to stack his administration with virulently anti-Muslim and anti-immigrant figures (one of whom, Frank Wuco, was explicitly mentioned in Justice Sonia Sotomayor's dissent) such as Stephen Miller, an architect of the first version of the ban, and Secretary of State Mike Pompeo, who have stated that Islam poses a threat to Western civilization and that American Muslims are potential threats by virtue of their religion. Individuals with such a record of anti-Muslim statements are fundamentally unqualified to undertake any review about potential threats posed by Muslim-majority countries to the United States.

We have worked on different sides of the United States' response to 9/11: one of us in Iraq, Guantanamo Bay and the Pentagon advising three defense secretaries, and the other serving our Iraqi coalition partners seeking refuge from targeted violence at the height of the war. Whether listening to inmates at Guantanamo Bay describing how recruiters influenced them with tales of U.S. injustice or watching as we turned our backs on Iraqis who laid their lives on the line for us, we both developed a deep appreciation for the gravity of our obligations as Americans — to justice, to humanity and to our own values.

Those obligations today mean building sober policy based on evidence, not fear, as well as fostering meaningful partnerships with our allies abroad. Trump's

travel ban and the Supreme Court ruling undermine the United States' ability to meet those obligations. The ban distracts from genuine threats and is driven by prejudice and fear — two emotions that neither make for good policy nor keep us safer at night.

The Muslim travel ban is just the latest in a long string of factless, fear-based policy choices that collectively have made us less safe, less faithful to our values and more isolated as a country. That the ban was upheld Tuesday by the highest court in the land is more than disappointing; it places us squarely, and ever more vulnerably, on the wrong side of history.

OTHER DHS NEWS

Man Accused Of Trying To Bribe ICE To Deport Wife

[Associated Press](#), July 1, 2018

PORTLAND, Ore. — A 48-year-old Portland man has been accused of trying to bribe a U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement officer in an effort to have his estranged wife and daughter deported.

The Oregon U.S. Attorney's Office says Antonio Burgos tried to bribe the officer on three separate occasions. Burgos made an initial court appearance Friday before U.S. Magistrate Judge Paul Papak.

Burgos pleaded not guilty and was released pending a two-day trial scheduled to begin Aug. 28.

A phone number believed to be his was not answering Friday.

Copyright 2018 Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten, or redistributed.

Feds, Former Student Reach Lawsuit Deal

By Mark Reagan

[Brownsville \(TX\) Herald](#), July 1, 2018

Four federal officials have agreed to settle a lawsuit brought by a former University of Texas at Brownsville student who alleges that the university unlawfully terminated his foreign student status resulting in a negative domino effect on his life, court documents show.

The student, only known as John Doe, is a native of the Republic of India and sued Secretary of Homeland Security Kirstjen Nielsen; United States Citizenship and Immigration Services Director L. Francis Cissna; USCIS Harlingen District Director Mario Ortiz; USCIS Field Office Director Norma A. Limon; the University of Texas Rio Grande Valley; UTRGV Student Employment Coordinator Maria Aragelia Salazar; UTRGV Director of International Admissions and Student Services

Samantha Lopez; and Associate Dean Javier A. Martinez last September.

The federal settlement does not apply to the UTRGV defendants.

Doe's identity is not revealed in the litigation because it could result in adverse immigration against the man, according to court documents.

mreagan@brownsvilleherald.com

GLOBAL MEDIA

E.U. Leaders Agree On The Outline Of A Migration Deal

By Quentin Ariès And Chico Harlan

[Washington Post](#), June 29, 2018

BRUSSELS — After working through the night at a tense summit, all 28 members of the European Union on Friday signed off on a joint statement of conclusions intended as the first step in resolving Europe's biggest fight of the moment: how to manage migrants coming to the continent.

While the specific proposals will need to be fleshed out, agreement on the outline of a deal may also help to preserve the tenure of Germany's Angela Merkel, who has been facing a rebellion on migration by members of her governing coalition that threatens her chancellorship.

European leaders agreed on Friday morning at 4:40 a.m. to push for screening centers in African countries where asylum claims could be evaluated, thus reducing the number of migrants who employ smugglers and attempt the dangerous journey across the Mediterranean Sea — in some cases only to have their asylum applications rejected.

So far, though, no African country has signalled an interest in hosting such a center.

The leaders also agreed that some European countries would establish centers within their own borders to process migrants seeking asylum after their arrival in the continent. Asylum seekers awarded the right to stay in Europe could be then resettled in other E.U. countries willing to host them.

Major questions remain about how the E.U. would distribute refugees to member states and how it would treat those whose claims are rejected.

Italian Prime Minister Giuseppe Conte told reporters when leaving the meeting that "Italy is no longer alone after this European summit."

Earlier in the evening, Italy's had refused to sign the joint conclusions — which also touched on defense, trade and technology — amid concerns that the bloc wasn't doing enough to relieve the burden of migration in front-line Mediterranean countries. The European

Council at that point released a statement that did not mention Italy but noted that because “one member reserved their position on the entire conclusions, no conclusions have been agreed at this stage.”

While Italy pushed for its European counterparts' greater support, other leaders were not keen to revise European rules that require asylum seekers to be processed in the country where they first arrive.

Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orbán later agreed to sign the joint conclusions only if E.U. countries could participate on a voluntary basis in accepting migrants whose asylum requests had been granted.

Ahead of the summit, Merkel had warned that the crisis over migration could decide “the fate of the E.U.”

It could decide her fate, as well. Her interior minister, Horst Seehofer, had signaled that he would block asylum seekers at the Bavarian border if the chancellor couldn't strike some kind of immigration deal. If Seehofer split with Merkel on the migration issue, he could pull his Christian Social Union from the governing coalition, threatening Merkel's 13-year run as Germany's leader.

Analysts say a major E.U. accord on migration remains difficult, given the growing impetus in several member countries to protect their own borders or reduce what they feel is a disproportionate burden.

The political stakes on migration have risen as anti-migrant leaders in Austria, Hungary, Poland and Italy have seized on the issue, with some describing a migrant “invasion,” even as arrivals from the Middle East and Africa have fallen dramatically.

So far this year, some 54,000 migrants have arrived in Europe — compared with almost 900,000 during a similar six-month period at the end of 2015. Europe has stemmed the flow in part by boosting cooperation with Libya, a major jumping-off point for migrants, and by building up that country's coast guard, which patrols the Mediterranean and regularly intercepts the dinghies and rafts bound for Europe.

“It's a plan to effectively cut down hard at the external borders, develop cooperation, process people outside of the European Union,” said Andrew Geddes, director of the Migration Policy Centre at the European University Institute in Florence. “But there's almost a fantasy island element to it.”

One possibility at the summit, which continues Friday, is that Merkel looks to make bilateral agreements that will allow Germany to send asylum seekers back to other European countries. Greek Prime Minister Alexis Tsipras told the Financial Times on Wednesday that he was open to such an agreement.

Chico Harlan reported from Rome.

Italy PM Cheers EU Migration Deal, Decision On Migrant Centers Later

[Reuters](#), June 29, 2018

Full-text stories from Reuters currently cannot be included in this document. You may, however, click the link above to access the story.

Europe Shifts Toward Tougher Approach On Immigration

By Bojan Pancevski And Valentina Pop

[Wall Street Journal](#), June 29, 2018

Full-text stories from the Wall Street Journal are available to Journal subscribers by clicking the link.

EU's Migrant Deal Reflects Ascendancy Of Nativist Parties

By Valentina Pop And Bojan Pancevski

[Wall Street Journal](#), June 29, 2018

Full-text stories from the Wall Street Journal are available to Journal subscribers by clicking the link.

Europe Wants To Outsource Asylum Processing. Critics Say It's Abdicating Its Responsibilities

By Chico Harlan And Sudarsan Raghavan

[Washington Post](#), June 29, 2018

Europe's splintered leaders proved during an intense summit this week that they could still unify behind one big idea: pushing this continent's migration challenges farther from its shores.

In an agreement reached Friday, the European Union's members said they would explore ways to build new centers, probably in Africa, where migrants could be screened for asylum — and from where only legitimate refugees might move on to Europe.

The idea echoes discussions elsewhere in the developed world, including in the United States, on how to outsource the contentious asylum process and cut down on the flow of arrivals. In Europe's case, the proposal also broadens an existing strategy of using African countries as partners that are willing to crack down on smugglers and intercept migrant vessels.

The European Union says the processing centers would reduce the number of people who attempt to cross the deadly Mediterranean Sea and would better enable a triaging of the crisis — separating the neediest refugees from migrants seeking economic opportunities. Remote vetting would also let the E.U. avoid the quandary of what to do with migrants whose asylum applications are denied but who come from countries with which Europe doesn't have deportation agreements.

But critics, including some politicians and analysts, say that Europe risks abdicating its responsibility at a time when migrant flows are drastically reduced from their 2015 peak, and that it would be inviting additional challenges with facilities hosted by poorer and less-stable countries, where people — including minors — could languish in unsafe conditions.

“Europe is really rolling the dice,” said Jill Goldenziel, an associate professor at the Marine Corps University, who is writing a book on the global migration crisis. “Europe would be required to maintain its own standards. It is incredibly hard to guarantee that, and particularly hard in a place like Libya or other developing countries that don’t adhere to the same human rights standards.”

In recent weeks, U.S. and Mexican officials have been discussing a somewhat different “safe third country” agreement, which could require Central American migrants crossing through Mexico to apply for settlement there and allow the United States to send back asylum seekers who do not do so. The United States and Canada have a similar agreement in place.

That would benefit the Trump administration by shrinking the number of Central American asylum seekers applying to live in the United States, but it remains unclear whether Mexican officials will embrace such a plan or whether they intend to use it as leverage in the ongoing trade talks with Washington.

Australia, meanwhile, has relied on a widely criticized strategy of holding asylum seekers in prisonlike detention centers on remote islands. At those centers, thousands of asylum seekers have been detained for years, and some have committed suicide.

The E.U. migration deal, which also calls for the creation of processing centers within Europe hosted by volunteer countries, offers few specifics about how the new system would work.

“This is, in fact, the easiest part of the task,” European Council President Donald Tusk said Friday of the agreement, “compared to what awaits us on the ground when we start implementing it.”

The E.U. said centers in outside countries would operate in “full respect of international law,” but it did not address how and where refugees would be resettled — a point of tension, because some countries in the bloc have refused to accept them, and swift handling of asylum seekers is necessary to prevent a backlog.

One key requirement, experts said, would be that the facilities have cooperation from outside monitors, including the International Organization for Migration and the United Nations’ refugee agency. In a joint letter Friday, the groups said that any reception centers must be “adequate, safe and dignified.”

Goldenziel said that although it is legal under international law to process asylum claims in one country before transferring successful applicants to another country, any resulting mistreatment of migrants — and the possibility that they might be sent back to places where their lives were endangered or they might be tortured — could raise challenges in the European Court of Human Rights.

Others have criticized the idea of the facilities on moral grounds. Gabi Zimmer, a member of the European Parliament and of Germany’s left-wing Die Linke party, said that the “E.U. is transferring its humanitarian responsibility onto other countries.”

The E.U. has gravitated to Africa in part because it has struggled to forge delicate agreements among its members about how to share the burden of asylum seekers once they arrive. Hungary’s anti-migrant leader, Viktor Orban, suggested two years ago that the E.U. should set up a “giant refugee city” in Libya to process asylum seekers as a way to keep the continent’s borders under “total control.” French President Emmanuel Macron has also been an advocate of the processing centers, saying last summer that if migrants were dealt with in Libya, they would avoid “taking crazy risks when they are not all eligible for asylum.”

“It’s the failure to reach key agreements [within Europe] that is driving this alternative agreement,” said Frank Mc Namara, an analyst at the Brussels-based European Policy Center.

As of Friday, no third country had offered to host the migrant reception centers, and at least two had rejected the idea outright.

On Thursday, Morocco’s foreign minister, Nasser Bourita, told reporters after meeting with his Spanish counterpart that such outsourcing of reception centers by the E.U. would be “counterproductive.” He criticized the proposed measures as “easy solutions” and said Morocco had always turned down that kind of approach to managing the flows of migrants.

If Morocco stands by its decision, it immediately throws a wrench into the E.U. effort to stop migrants from leaving North Africa’s shores. Morocco is becoming a key waypoint for migrants, who have increasingly moved westward in their route across the Mediterranean.

Tunisia, another country viewed by the E.U. as a possible host for migrant centers, has also reportedly rejected the idea. Tahar Cherif, Tunisia’s ambassador to the E.U., told the Guardian newspaper that his country had dismissed a similar proposal a few months earlier. Tunisia, he said, has “neither the capacity nor the means to organize these detention centers.” The country, he said, is grappling with high unemployment and other

economic woes, as well as the spillover from the civil war in neighboring Libya.

France, one of the key proponents of the E.U. migration deal, considers Libya an ideal location for the processing centers, since it remains the primary migrant launchpad to Europe. But human rights groups and nongovernmental organizations have long criticized the E.U.'s policy of supporting the Libyan coast guard, which intercepts migrants' boats and returns people to Libyan shores, where they are often warehoused in decrepit, overcrowded detention centers and face exploitation and violence. The E.U. said Friday that it would "step up its support" for the Libyan coast guard and other parts of the country.

Karline Kleijer, emergency program manager for Doctors Without Borders, said in a statement Friday that the E.U.'s goal was to "block people at the doorstep of Europe."

"They attempt to pay off countries to do their dirty work, while seeking to ensure there are no inconvenient witnesses," she said.

Last weekend alone, some 2,000 people were returned to Libya by its coast guard, the charity said.

In U.S. And Europe, Migration Conflict Points To Deeper Political Problems

By Amanda Taub And Max Fisher

[New York Times](#), June 29, 2018

Major political conflicts are playing out both in the United States and in Europe over immigration and refugees. While the clashes might look similar on the surface, and do in fact share much in common, they're also different in subtle but crucial ways.

A side-by-side comparison suggests that while the conflicts are sometimes about immigration itself, often they have more to do with race and ethnic identity — or with simple politics.

What's similar between the U.S. and Europe: Despite the urgent tone on both sides of the Atlantic, the renewed calls to control unauthorized immigration are not tied to any actual surges at the borders.

In the United States, in fact, border crossings have been low for years, and in Europe they are now far lower than they were at the peak of the refugee crisis a few years ago. Rather, the migrant crisis is a backlash against migrants and refugees, and the political fights and extreme policies that has set off.

The anger, research suggests, often stems less from migration specifically than from a broader anxiety over social change. When people feel a sense of threat or a loss of control, they sometimes become more attached to ethnic and national identities.

For some people, the antipathy is explicitly racial. But for many others, the mere fact of cultural change itself can be unsettling. Immigration, unauthorized or otherwise, is just one of the changes that bring about a feeling of the loss of control. Economic dislocation, changes in social hierarchies and demographic change can all produce the same effect.

But when asylum seekers arrive without permission or warning, that can add to the sense of anxiety by making the border — perhaps the most obvious symbol of national identity and territorial protection — seem weak.

On both sides of the Atlantic, migrants and asylum seekers have become, for many voters, a symbol of the political establishment's failure to protect them and their interests.

What's different: In the United States, where the federal government has centralized control over immigration policy, President Trump has been able to translate the anti-migrant backlash into policy, including by separating families at the border.

But in the European Union, which has 28 member states, the crisis is more complex, touching on the bloc's need for political unity. There is also the challenge of addressing the status of migrants and refugees not just at the external borders where they arrive but also within Europe after they have crossed a border.

There is a deep conflict over what European policy should be between some front-line countries like Italy, which see themselves as carrying an unfair burden as migrants arrive after crossing the Mediterranean, and countries like Hungary and Germany that strongly resist taking in additional asylum seekers.

What's similar: Efforts to "solve" unauthorized border crossings have highlighted a central political contradiction: American and European Union law requires governments to let refugees apply for asylum no matter how many arrive. But the politics of migration demands some sort of limits on their numbers.

The only way to resolve that contradiction without violating the law — its letter if not its spirit — is by preventing people from arriving or deterring them from setting out on their journeys in the first place.

There is also a contradiction between old ideas of national identity, which were rooted in fixed demographics, versus a modern world in which international migration is more possible than ever.

But because public demand for harsh immigration policies is often driven by a broad range of social changes and issues, and not just migrants, whatever policies end up being enacted can never quite satisfy those who had demanded them.

What's different: The Trump administration has been upfront about its deterrence goal. It has used family separations and prosecutions as a way to discourage those with a mind to try to relocate to the United States.

Mr. Trump went further last week, calling for immigrants to be denied due process. That "long and complicated legal process," he said on Twitter, "is not the way to go." Instead, he said, "people must simply be stopped at the Border and told they cannot come into the U.S. illegally." For the moment, at least, the president does not seem to be making an actual policy proposal.

European leaders have been more circumspect in their public statements, but they also have pursued policies that deter asylum claims by making the crossing too dangerous or impossible for migrants to attempt. They have worked with the governments of Sudan and Libya despite evidence of serious human rights abuses in those countries.

What's similar: For both migrants and those hoping to obtain refugee status, the politics of the crisis point to greater hardship.

As long as people believe they face greater danger and hardship in their home countries than they would elsewhere, many will set out for new lands. Neither the United States nor Europe appears focused on easing the crises in Central America, the Middle East and other regions from which people flee. So policies intended to deter arrivals are likely to do little more than worsen the perils for migrants.

What's different: Political and geographic differences between the United States and Europe mean that the nature of this hardship, and which groups of migrants are at greatest risk, will vary.

Those traveling to Europe face a growing risk of being swept up in countries like Libya or Sudan that have cut deals with Europe to limit migration. Those governments, or militias working with them, have imposed tremendous suffering on migrants. Some migrants, reports say, have even been sold as slaves.

But because the abuses happen far from European soil and are not committed by European officials directly, they have been easy for the public to ignore.

The migrant trek to the United States is also dangerous, but the Mexican government is less willing to go to Libyan-style extremes. The likely winner of next month's Mexican presidential election has said he will not cooperate with the United States to cut off migration routes.

So, unlike Europe, the United States must conduct much of the work of its border enforcement and deterrence policies itself.

The Trump administration, deliberately or not, has been testing the limits of American tolerance for extreme border enforcement, for instance by separating parents from their children. Those policies have drawn considerable public attention and protest, becoming a focus for political conflict.

What's similar: Both Europe and the United States are facing an especially sharp version of a choice that has divided their populations for decades: What sort of society do they wish to be? Do they wish to be immigrant nations with continual demographic and cultural change? Or do they wish to keep their national identities fixed?

The question is divisive, so both American and European leaders have long sought compromises that don't fully resolve the matter. But that has baked contradictions into their immigration systems that make repeated controversies inevitable — and it's not clear whether that can continue indefinitely.

As immigration and differing birthrates make countries less white, this conflict over national identity is increasingly dividing politics in both the United States and Europe.

What's different: Those politics are playing out very differently in the two systems, putting them under very different sorts of strain.

In the United States, most voters are growing more tolerant of immigration, but a committed minority is increasingly demanding limits on immigration in all forms. Because that minority makes the issue a top priority, it holds considerable power over policy.

The two-party American system means that the issue has polarized voters. Both sides see the United States' core character as at risk of being destroyed. That feeling of existential, zero-sum conflict can make people feel that extreme action is justified to prevent victory for the other side, undermining democratic norms.

Europe's political crisis looks different. Establishment leaders like Chancellor Angela Merkel of Germany, seen as responsible for the crisis, are at risk of losing power. Populist leaders who promise to overturn the status quo are gaining it.

This is putting the European Union itself at greater risk.

At the moment, the bloc does not have the power to redistribute asylum obligations to take pressure off border countries like Italy and Greece. Doing so would require new powers, or the consent of all member states, but there is little public support for either amid the frustration and fear over migration.

It is possible that the United States and the European Union could each find immigration policies just palatable enough to forestall greater political breakdown. But that will not solve the underlying question of what

place immigrants have in American and European societies. It is more polarizing than it has been in years.

Europe Moves In Parallel To U.S. To Manage Immigration

By Valentina Pop

[Wall Street Journal](#), June 30, 2018

Full-text stories from the Wall Street Journal are available to Journal subscribers by clicking the link.

Spain's Migrant Wave Grows, Even As Europe's Subsides

By Raphael Minder

[New York Times](#), June 30, 2018

Spain's new Socialist government has waded straight into Europe's migration crisis — out of both choice and necessity.

Shortly after taking office in early June, Prime Minister Pedro Sánchez won plaudits from aid groups for welcoming to Spain 630 migrants from the Aquarius, a rescue ship that had been turned away by Italy and Malta. But at home, Mr. Sánchez is under pressure to stem a sudden influx of migrants crossing from Morocco on inflatable boats.

The number of unauthorized migrants arriving in Europe from Africa, the Middle East and Asia has fallen sharply since 2016 — except in Spain, where it has soared.

Spain's situation underlines its reliance on Moroccan authorities to stop migrants who try either to cross the Strait of Gibraltar or to climb the fences that surround Spain's two enclaves in North Africa, Ceuta and Melilla. The increased flow has raised concerns in Spain that Morocco may have deliberately relaxed surveillance along its beaches facing Spain.

"Everyone is using migrants and asylum seekers these days as pawns, so why wouldn't Morocco?" asked Judith Sunderland, an associate director at Human Rights Watch.

"Over the years, Morocco has used migration as a leverage in its bilateral relations with Spain, and the E.U. is projecting such panic over boat migration these days that it's likely different actors will try to seek an advantage."

On Thursday, Spain's interior and foreign ministers went to Rabat to meet their Moroccan counterparts and discuss migration after two weeks in which more than 2,000 migrants made the crossing by boat. Most were rescued at sea.

Josep Borrell, Spain's new foreign minister, described the cooperation with Morocco as "excellent,"

but warned that "we will probably face a rise in the number of arrivals by boat this summer."

Mr. Borrell's troubling forecast came as the situation in the southern Spanish region of Andalusia had already "reached a critical point that clearly exceeds our infrastructure capacity," said Samuel Linares, who coordinates Spanish Red Cross activities in the province of Málaga, a part of Andalusia.

In fact, the Spanish authorities have been flouting their own migration protocols because of the squeeze on their staff and infrastructure. People who reach Spain illegally spend up to 72 hours in police custody, and if they are not deported right away, they are supposed to go to official migrant centers for up to 60 days, while their asylum claims are reviewed.

But the migrant centers are full. The authorities have turned to groups like the Red Cross to shelter and feed migrants, and in Málaga, the police have resorted recently to housing about 250 migrants in a sports center.

Kandjoura Drame, a 17-year-old from Guinea, is one of 34 West Africans who set off from a beach near Nador, Morocco, in an inflatable boat. After a night at sea, they were picked up by Spain's maritime rescue services and then handed over to the police in the port city of Málaga.

Eventually, they ended up in an apartment fitted with bunk beds and managed by the Red Cross, on the square that was the birthplace of Pablo Picasso.

"A lot has happened and I don't know what can happen next," a despondent and worried Mr. Drame said, as he struggled to recount his harrowing journey.

The atmosphere in Málaga contrasts sharply with that in Valencia when the Aquarius docked on June 17. More than 2,000 Red Cross workers, medical staff and interpreters welcomed the migrants, who received a special humanitarian permit to stay for at least 45 days in Spain without threat of deportation.

"Nobody is offering special treatment for those who reach Andalusia," said Francisco de la Torre, the mayor of Málaga. "We will need a better and far more coordinated response if we want to cope with this crisis."

European Union leaders met this week in Brussels to try to resolve their divisions over migration. After a marathon round of talks, they agreed early Friday to set up new migrant centers within the bloc, as well as study whether to set up centers outside its borders, but without specifying how such plans would be implemented.

With its mainland just nine miles from Africa, Spain has long struggled with migration, and not only from Morocco. Last November, Spanish authorities sparked a public outcry when they put about 500 migrants from

Algeria in a penitentiary because of a space shortage, before deporting them.

In the last year, Spain has played a more prominent role in the crisis. The number of migrants reaching the country nearly tripled last year, to almost 22,000, and reported drownings off the Spanish coast almost doubled, according to the International Organization for Migration; the pace of arrivals has continued to climb this year.

It has become harder to reach other parts of southern Europe, prompting traffickers to target Spain. A 2016 agreement between the European Union and Turkey has stemmed the flow of refugees reaching Greece, while Italy and Malta have denied rescue ships access to their ports.

"Mafias know how to switch quickly and find the easiest access ways to Europe, and I think we're seeing a clear reactivation of the Moroccan route," said Rafael Puyol, the director of the demographics observatory at the IE University in Madrid. Morocco, he added, "sees migration as an ingredient in its negotiations with Europe."

Mr. de la Torre, the Málaga mayor, said the influx could be "a way for Morocco to send a strong reminder to the new Spanish government and Europe that helping Morocco matters."

After meeting Mr. Borrell on Thursday, the Moroccan foreign minister, Nasser Bourita, said his government opposed proposals to set up screening centers for migrants outside the European Union. Mr. Bourita told reporters that the migration crisis could not be addressed with "easy solutions and counterproductive mechanisms."

In Málaga, some migrants, particularly those from French-speaking African countries, say they want to travel to France. Others hope to settle in Spain.

Mohamed Sani, a 20-year old from Ghana, said he had paid the equivalent of more than \$1,150 for the boat crossing, money that he had earned by carrying bags of cashews for Indian traders in his hometown. He wants to go to Barcelona, where he has friends and there is a famous soccer club.

"I've watched them play many times on TV — and a place that has good football must be a good place to live," he said.

Spain Feels The Heat As Migrants Shift Route Into Europe

[Associated Press](#), June 29, 2018

TARIFA, Spain (AP) – Askanda Fopa Ponye was jubilant as he stepped off an orange rescue ship onto Spanish soil, one of the latest arrivals amid a wave of

migrants that has turned the shortest route from North Africa to Europe into the most popular one.

The 24-year-old Cameroonian survived a 9-month trip across the African continent and a 10-hour overnight ordeal on the Mediterranean Sea, paddling north from Morocco in a fragile inflatable boat that he bought along with seven other people.

Rescued at sea, he and 74 others finally disembarked in the southern city of Algeciras. Fopa Ponye carried nothing but his wet clothes, his determination to find a job in Barcelona and a message for European Union leaders who want stricter policies to curb the numbers of those seeking a better life in Europe.

"Migrants are not coming here to do bad things. I don't come here looking for trouble," Fopa Ponye said, speaking as the British outpost of Gibraltar and its famous Rock towered across a bay filled with luxury yachts.

The U.N. refugee agency says 17,781 people have made it to Spain so far this year, both by land and by sea, outpacing the arrivals by boat to Italy (16,452) or Greece (13,120).

The arrivals this year to Spain's southern coast are already the highest for the past decade. Although far from the flows seen in Greece in 2015, and Italy over the following two years, they show how routes are shifting westward as policies are adjusted.

Of the 973 who lost their lives in the Mediterranean so far this year, nearly a third (293) died trying to reach Spain, the International Organization for Migration said. That figure does not include an estimated 100 migrants who were missing at sea and feared dead Friday off the Libyan coast when their smuggling boat sank.

Despite a sharp decline from 2015 peak levels of economic migrants and asylum-seekers arriving in Europe, the renewed popularity of the Western Mediterranean route is straining Spain's security forces and social safety networks.

With police stations and juvenile facilities overflowing in Cadiz, Spain's southernmost province, authorities are setting up makeshift housing in sports facilities, rented hostels or even ferry terminals.

On Tuesday, the day Fopa Ponye was rescued, the sports complex in Tarifa held more than 600 people, some who came all the way from Bangladesh or Sri Lanka. Women, some of them pregnant and others with newborns, slept on the floor of a basketball court, sharing it with dozens of unaccompanied teenagers.

By Wednesday, authorities stopped receiving more people in Tarifa, and a new facility had to be opened in the nearby coastal town of Barbate. There were moments of tension Thursday when dozens of

Moroccans stormed an exit and managed to escape police.

Spain has bilateral agreements with Morocco, Algeria and other African countries to return their citizens, making it nearly impossible for any arrivals from there to get asylum. But most sub-Saharan Africans and others arriving in the country are given an expulsion order that authorities are rarely able to execute.

Most are released and continue north into France and beyond. Among those who stay – awaiting asylum and unable to work – a small number receive public assistance for up to two years. But many end up homeless or at the mercy of criminals. Local governments, especially in cities like Madrid or Barcelona, offer limited accommodations and assistance, relying frequently on charities.

Aid groups say the approach needs to be rethought. The early summer surge in arrivals is exposing Spain's response as ill-equipped, underfunded and too reliant on improvisation.

The increase also comes as a divisive debate over migration has re-emerged in Europe. At an EU summit on Thursday and Friday in Brussels, the 28 leaders of the bloc agreed on several measures to better manage migration into Europe.

In 2006, offering funds and training to the coast guard and security forces in Senegal reduced a wave of nearly 32,000 arrivals in the Canary Islands.

But Spain's approach also has been marred by an asylum system that has more than 43,000 unsolved petitions – last year only 4,670 people were granted protection – and controversial, on-the-spot returns of migrants caught entering the Spanish enclaves of Ceuta and Melilla over a fence in North Africa.

The Rev. Josep Buades, a Jesuit priest who visits migrants weekly at some of the detention centers known as CIEs, said "Spain's past experience should be seen as a showcase of the challenges that lie ahead for the European Union, rather than a path to success."

The Associated Press was denied access this week to visit CIEs in Tarifa and Algeciras, the latter a former prison that Spain's Ombudsman Office said should be closed due to poor conditions. Run by Spain's police with little public supervision, these centers also seem to be models for similar facilities being proposed either on European soil or abroad.

Jose Villahoz, head of the local aid group Algeciras Acoge, said the EU shouldn't be looking for ways to deprive migrants of their freedom.

"If the rights of the nationals of the transit countries are not even respected, it's going to be even worse for those coming from sub-Saharan countries," said Villahoz, adding it was "deplorable to make those

countries in northern African responsible" for the migration flows into Europe.

Spanish Prime Minister Pedro Sanchez has said he will look into how to improve the CIEs, but there are no plans to close them.

After winning praise earlier this month for taking in 629 migrants on the Aquarius rescue ship that Italy and Malta rejected, Spain's new center-left government is under pressure to deliver an equivalent response to the migrant arrivals on the southern coast.

But the European debate feels far away in the EU's "south of the south," as Villahoz calls Spain's neglected Andalusian coast. Instead, all eyes are on negotiations with Morocco, which many in Spain blame for opening or closing the valve of departures from its shores, ahead of talks with the EU on fishing, agricultural and other topics.

On Thursday, Sanchez sent Spain's interior and foreign ministers to Morocco for meetings with their counterparts. Sanchez himself is planning a visit there this summer.

Khalid Zerouali, Morocco's director of migration and border surveillance, said his country is under new pressure amid the clampdown on the sea migration route between Libya and Italy.

He also told the AP that Morocco isn't interested in trying to determine which migrants are eligible for asylum in Europe. The plan to make such decisions in some African countries is being discussed by the EU as one way to tamp down arrival numbers.

"That's not the solution," Zerouali said, because people often use Morocco as a departure point for Spain, adding that about 25,000 migrants have been stopped this year.

Buades, the Catholic priest, says Europe should explore policies that favor legal migration while rethinking its overall asylum system and its treatment of arrivals. But that is difficult in the current climate, he added.

"The Europe that we live in has dived into a populist and xenophobic discourse that makes it nearly impossible to improve the current system," Buades said.

Amira El Masaiti in Rabat, Morocco, contributed to this report.

This story has been corrected to give the priest's first name as Josep, not Joan.

Copyright 2018 Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten, or redistributed.

Andres Manuel Lopez Obrador Wins The Mexico Presidential Election As His Competitors Concede Based On Exit Polls Giving Him A Landslide Victory

By Patrick J. McDonnell

[Los Angeles Times](#), July 1, 2018

Leftist candidate Andres Manuel Lopez Obrador has won Mexico's presidential election as his competitors have conceded based on exit polls showing he is headed for a landslide victory.

Those polls showed Lopez Obrador — who vowed a sweeping “transformation” of a nation where voters have expressed broad discontent with rampant corruption, rising crime and a sluggish economy — ahead by 20 percentage points.

Shortly after the last polls closed at 8 p.m. in Mexico City, and before any actual results were released, the other candidates began conceding defeat.

“I recognize that the tendencies do not favor me,” Jose Antonio Meade, presidential hopeful of the ruling Institutional Revolutionary Party, or PRI, said in a speech at the party headquarters in Mexico City. “At this moment I will have to recognize that, in accordance with the tendencies, it was Andres Manuel Lopez Obrador who obtained the majority. He will have the responsibility of directing executive power. And for the good of Mexico I wish him the best success.”

Ricardo Anaya of the center-right National Action Party soon followed, as did the sole independent candidate, Jaime “El Bronco” Rodriguez.

“I wish him success for the best of Mexico,” Anaya said.

Official results were not expected for several hours.

If formally declared the winner, Lopez Obrador would take office on Dec. 1, succeeding current President Enrique Peña Nieto of the PRI.

The concession from the PRI candidate came after exit polls from the Televisa network showed Lopez Obrador with a commanding lead of approximately 20 percentage points compared with Anaya, his nearest challenger.

The lead corresponded to preelection polls that had long showed Lopez Obrador as a runaway winner. The challengers had been unable to chip away at Lopez Obrador's lead, which was largely fueled by voter anger at the status quo of Mexican politics.

According to the Televisa exit polls, Lopez Obrador won between 43% and 49% of the vote and Anaya garnered between 23% and 27%.

Meade was in third place, according to the Televisa exit polls, with between 22% and 26% of the vote.

It appeared to be a humiliating third-place finish for the PRI, which currently holds the presidency and dominated Mexican politics for much of the 20th century.

Reaction to the apparent Lopez Obrador victory was swift.

“We have an electoral tsunami,” Marco A. Fernandez, an analyst at the Technical Institute of Monterrey, said in a Twitter message. “High electoral participation punished corruption at the ballot [box]. The citizens participated and expressed their outrage and anger.”

The electoral process unfolded without major disruptions, authorities said, despite scattered acts of violence and some reports of missing ballots.

Election day was proceeding “with tranquillity [and] without major incidents,” Lorenzo Cordova, head of Mexico's electoral institute, said in a statement.

In the run-up to the elections, dozens of office-seekers have been slain, mostly candidates for local posts in provincial areas where organized crime holds sway. Police were out in force on Sunday throughout the nation in elections that officials called the largest in the country's history.

Apart from the presidential vote, Mexicans were also electing a new federal legislature, eight state governors, a Mexico City mayor and representatives for thousands of state and municipal posts.

Under sunny skies in Mexico City, early turnout appeared to be robust.

Lopez Obrador ran under the banner of his own political party, the National Regeneration Movement, known as Morena.

The movement was launched four years ago after Lopez Obrador — a veteran politician and former mayor of Mexico City — split from the center-left party that he had formerly headed.

His victory could trigger a sea change in Mexican politics and significantly alter Mexico's relations with its giant neighbor, the United States, experts said.

Many observers expect that a Lopez Obrador administration would be less accommodating to Washington — especially to the Trump administration, which has consistently assailed Mexico and Mexicans — than past presidents here.

Mexico shares an almost 2,000-mile border with the United States, a source of both tension — the border is a hub of illegal immigration and drug-smuggling — and of tens of billions of dollars annually in international trade.

Lopez Obrador, 64, who was a losing candidate in the last two presidential contests, has championed a leftist, populist agenda that has resonated in a nation

where many are fed up with corruption, rising crime and a slumping economy.

He has vowed a grandiose “transformation” of the nation akin to past historical events — independence from Spain, the 19th century reign of President Benito Juarez, and the Mexican Revolution of the early 20th century.

His rhetoric has targeted “the mafia of power,” his depiction of the elite clique of political parties and business interests that have long dominated Mexico. It is an anti-status quo message that has overwhelmed similar vows of “change” from the presidential aspirants from more traditional parties.

Among his promises: increasing social welfare payments to the poor and elderly, providing scholarships to the young and reviewing various projects of the current government, including energy and education reforms and the construction of a new Mexico City airport.

“We are struggling,” said Ivan Jaramillo, 36, a tall, tattooed industrial engineer and Lopez Obrador backer who cast his ballot Sunday. “Yet we see how our leaders get richer.”

He voted in Coyoacan, a leafy enclave on the south side of Mexico City and the same voting district as Lopez Obrador, who was mobbed by journalists and supporters as he cast his ballot early in the day.

After turning in his ballot, the candidate posed for photos with his wife and young son.

When he and his family tried to make their way to a waiting car, they were swarmed by supporters chanting: “President!” and “It’s an honor to be with Obrador.”

Two helicopters and several drones circled overhead.

Lopez Obrador’s fiery rhetoric has clearly drawn many supporters, but his candidacy has also stoked deep concern among many who view him as a potential autocrat and as an unreconstructed leftist who could wreck an already shaky economy.

In the wealthy Mexico City enclave of Bosques de las Lomas, Veronica Soto, 46, stepped into a waiting Audi sedan after casting her ballot.

Soto, a stay-at-home mom, said she was voting for Ricardo Anaya, the presidential candidate of the National Action Party, largely because she is afraid of a Lopez Obrador presidency — a fear especially common among upper-class Mexicans.

Lopez Obrador’s nationalistic outlook and misgivings about market-oriented reforms are signs “that he wants to turn Mexico into Venezuela,” said Soto, echoing a common criticism here.

“He wants to take Mexico backward,” she said, “to a situation where the poor won’t be rich and the rich won’t be rich either.”

She said many in this neighborhood of lush haciendas tucked behind high walls are nervous about what will happen to the economy if Lopez Obrador wins.

The front-runner has consistently rejected opposition characterizations of him as Mexico’s version of Hugo Chavez — the late Venezuelan leftist leader and long-time U.S. antagonist. Lopez Obrador has said he favors a new free-trade agreement with the United States and has reassured business interests that he will protect investments.

For almost a century, Mexican presidents have come from two political parties: the long-dominant Institutional Revolutionary Party, or PRI, which emerged from the Mexican Revolution to rule the country in autocratic fashion for more than seven decades; and the center-right National Action Party, which wrested the presidency from the PRI in elections in 2000 and 2006.

The current president, Enrique Peña Nieto, standard-bearer of the PRI, is barred by term limits from running for reelection. His time in office has been widely seen as ineffective, and he has suffered from historically low approval ratings.

The seemingly inevitability of Lopez Obrador’s victory has left the principal candidates from Mexico’s traditional parties — the PRI and the National Action Party — in what many here have dubbed a race for second place.

The PRI candidate, Jose Antonio Meade, 49, a lawyer and Yale-educated economist, was named the ruling party nominee even though he was not a party member. The idea was to put forward a candidate not tarnished with the PRI’s history of corruption and the current administration’s legacy of ineffectiveness. The plan doesn’t appear to have worked.

Meade, a prototypical technocrat with a broad grasp of the issues, has shown little spark and seems to lack political charisma. His “All for Mexico” coalition, led by the PRI, could be headed for a humiliating third-place finish, despite the massive resources of the PRI, its considerable get-out-the-vote expertise and the party’s legendary proficiency at what is referred to here as electoral “alchemy” — the ability to transform losing candidates into winners through various unsavory means, from ballot-box stuffing to a large turnout among cemetery-dwellers.

Anaya, presidential aspirant of the right-center National Action Party, has failed to gain traction after an early debate performance seemed to bolster his standing.

Allegations of money-laundering — vehemently denied by the candidate — appear to have hurt Anaya, who, at 39, is the youngest of the three major candidates. His upper-class background, bossy disposition and often-acerbic campaign tactics don't appear to have endeared him among the multitudes of mostly poor and working-class Mexican voters.

Sunday's elections also marked the first time that an independent candidate appeared on the presidential ballot. The independent campaign of Jaime "El Bronco" Rodríguez, ex-governor of the northern state of Nuevo Leon, has provided some comic relief — he proposed a new law cutting off the hands of convicted thieves. But Rodríguez was not expected to mount a serious challenge to the major presidential candidates.

Andrés Manuel López Obrador Poised To Win Mexican Presidential Race

By Joshua Partlow And Maya Averbuch
[Washington Post](#), July 1, 2018

Andrés Manuel López Obrador, an anti-corruption crusader and former mayor, has a commanding lead in Mexico's election, according to several exit polls, positioning him to be the first leftist president since Mexico began its transition to democracy more than three decades ago.

Several exit polls gave him double-digit leads over his two closest competitors, and both of them conceded the race shortly after polls closed on Sunday night.

"Andrés Manuel López Obrador has the majority," said Jose Antonio Meade, the candidate of the governing Institutional Revolutionary Party.

López Obrador, 64, has dominated polls this election season, riding a wave of anger over government corruption and record-breaking drug-war violence.

President Trump loomed in the background of this vote. He has not been a wedge issue in the election — all candidates have opposed his policies and anti-Mexican rhetoric — but the new Mexican president will have to manage cross-border relations that are unusually fraught.

López Obrador, a former mayor of Mexico City, represents an emphatic rejection of the traditional political parties and politicians whom he regularly calls the "mafia of power." In recent decades, Mexico has been led by technocrats and pro-American politicians, while López Obrador's role models are Mexican independence and revolutionary leaders who stood up to more powerful foreign countries.

He was competing against Ricardo Anaya, an ambitious 39-year-old former president of the right-leaning National Action Party (PAN); and a 49-year-old

Yale-trained economist, Jose Antonio Meade, representing the governing Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI). Both have lagged in the polls.

López Obrador's opponents have sought to portray him as a dangerous populist who will lead Mexico back to failed economic models involving subsidies and state intervention, while provoking more tension with Trump's administration.

But the unpopularity of President Enrique Peña Nieto and the PRI — which has ruled Mexico for most of the past century — hobbled the candidate from his party and prompted voters to search for an alternative to traditional candidates. (Peña Nieto is not running; Mexican presidents are limited to one term.)

López Obrador grew up in a middle-class family in the Gulf Coast state of Tabasco and began his political career helping indigenous villagers with public works projects, which exposed him to Mexico's glaring inequality. He broke away from the PRI in the late 1980s and joined a leftist opposition party. López Obrador grew famous as a protest leader against voter fraud and the abuses of the state-owned oil industry.

He was elected mayor of Mexico City in 2000 — his only electoral victory — and boosted social spending for single mothers, the handicapped and the elderly. Major projects, such as an elevated highway through the city, and the revitalization of downtown neighborhoods also boosted his popularity.

After two failed presidential bids, López Obrador has tempered his message this year. While he still emphasizes the fight against extreme poverty, saying it will lead to less violence and a stronger economy, he has portrayed himself as more pro-business and pro-American than in the past. But his critics worry that he would roll back a recent policy to allow private investment in the oil industry and cancel a multibillion-dollar airport project in Mexico City.

Election day began with the head of Mexico's electoral agency, Lorenzo Cordova, urging all sides to play by the rules. Cordova called voting "the most important tool that citizens have in a democracy to exercise control over power."

Mexico has a long history of voter fraud, although elections have dramatically improved in recent years. In the past two presidential elections, López Obrador blamed fraud for his losses. In 2006, he refused to recognize the official results, and his supporters occupied a main Mexico City boulevard for weeks in protest. Analysts worry that a closer-than-expected result, or an upset by one of the other candidates, might lead to new allegations of fraud or even unrest and violence. Election officials insist the voting system is safe and secure.

Voting proceeded without major problems Sunday at the majority of the 156,807 polling places, but there were reports that some voting booths opened more than an hour late in Mexico City and other states. Around midday, a small fire broke out in the election agency headquarters, prompting a brief evacuation. It did not appear to cause a major disruption.

López Obrador's critics warn that he will be more combative toward the United States than the current president, Peña Nieto, and that U.S.-Mexico conflict could drastically escalate if he chooses to fight with Trump. In prior years, López Obrador was a critic of the North American Free Trade Agreement, or NAFTA, but he and his team have insisted they want to preserve it and maintain good relations with the Trump administration.

Trump has regularly attacked Mexico for not doing enough to stop drugs, crime and undocumented immigrants from entering the United States. He has also initiated a renegotiation of NAFTA, saying Mexico has stolen U.S. jobs, and intends to build a border wall.

López Obrador, a famously early riser, arrived at about 7:30 a.m. at a polling station in southern Mexico City. He gave a thumbs-up to the crowd after casting his ballot. "This is a historic day," López Obrador said.

"We represent the possibility of a real change, of a transformation," he added.

Anaya and Meade voted later in the morning, as did as Peña Nieto. The president said the orderly and peaceful vote showed the growing strength of Mexico's democracy.

"I'm convinced this will be truly historic for this country and it will reaffirm our democratic vocation," Peña Nieto said after voting.

Sunday's elections were the largest in Mexico's history, with voters choosing more than 3,200 positions at all levels of government. Among these were 628 members of the National Congress, who will be able to be reelected for the first time in nearly a century; eight state governors; and mayors of more than 1,500 cities, including Mexico City.

López Obrador's leftist party, the National Regeneration Movement, or Morena, is hoping to capture a majority in the congress, which would be a remarkable rise for a party he founded four years ago.

The campaign season has been marked by violence, with some 130 candidates and campaign staffers assassinated across the country.

By the time voting was supposed to begin in Ecatepec — a working-class city north of Mexico's capital — more than 100 people were at the gate of a local cultural center that was serving a polling station. As

election officials waited for poll workers, the crowd started to whistle to demand that the gates be opened.

"If they don't pay attention to us now, do you think they'll pay attention to the votes?" shouted Miguel Angel Serrano, 67, who was at the front of the line.

Mexico state has traditionally been a stronghold of the PRI, and it is also the home state of Peña Nieto. Such areas are seen as barometers for the shifting political mood in Mexico, and its poverty and widespread violence are glaring examples of the most pressing issues in this year's vote.

"The PRI has won here for many years, but this year it's going to lose, because dissent is high," Luis Valdepeña Bastida, 51, said as he waited to cast his ballot.

Valdepeña had voted for López Obrador in the past two elections and planned to do the same Sunday. He said he was tired of daily murders and the poor education system.

"Voting is the only tool we have to ensure that this corrupt system changes," he said. "The people are fed up."

Others found López Obrador's promises for change unrealistic.

Keila Gonzalez Garcia, 33, who works for a company that produces personal hygiene products, said she was preparing to cast her vote for Anaya, because she felt that the PAN would prevent a disastrous presidency.

"I'm voting for him to make sure the peje does not win," she said, using López Obrador's nickname. "He has a rose-tinted idea of the world, but I don't think it's possible. . . . Where is he going to get all the money for his plans?"

Leftist Wins Mexico Presidency In Landslide With Mandate To Reshape Nation

By Azam Ahmed And Paulina Villegas

[New York Times](#), July 1, 2018

Riding a wave of populist anger fueled by rampant corruption and violence, the leftist Andrés Manuel López Obrador was elected president of Mexico on Sunday, in a landslide victory that upended the nation's political establishment and handed him a sweeping mandate to reshape the country.

Mr. López Obrador's win puts a leftist leader at the helm of Latin America's second-largest economy for the first time in decades, a prospect that has filled millions of Mexicans with hope — and the nation's elites with trepidation.

The outcome represents a clear rejection of the status quo in the nation, which for the last quarter century has been defined by a centrist vision and an embrace of globalization that many Mexicans feel has not served them.

The core promises of Mr. López Obrador's campaign — to end corruption, reduce violence and address Mexico's endemic poverty — were immensely popular with voters, but they come with questions he and his new government may struggle to answer.

How he will pay for his ambitious slate of social programs without overspending and harming the economy? How will he rid the government of bad actors when some of those same people were a part of his campaign? Can he make a dent in the unyielding violence of the drug war, which left Mexico with more homicides last year than any time in the last two decades?

And how will Mr. López Obrador, a firebrand with a tendency to dismiss his critics in the media and elsewhere, govern?

In the end, the nation's desire for change outweighed any of the misgivings the candidate inspired.

"It is time for a change, it's time to go with López Obrador, and see what happens," said Juan de Dios Rodríguez, 70, a farmer in the state of Hidalgo, a longtime bastion of the governing Institutional Revolutionary Party, or PRI, which has dominated politics in Mexico for nearly his entire life. "This will be my first time voting for a different party."

In his third bid for the presidency, Mr. López Obrador, 64, won in what authorities called the largest election in Mexican history, with some 3,400 federal, state and local races contested in all.

A global repudiation of the establishment has brought populist leaders to power in the United States and Europe, and conservative ones to several countries in Latin America, including Colombia after an election last month.

"The recent elections in Latin America have exhibited the same demand for change," said Laura Chinchilla, the former president of Costa Rica. "The results are not endorsements of ideologies, but rather demands for change, a fatigue felt by people waiting for answers that simply have not arrived."

Mr. López Obrador, who vowed to cut his own salary and raise those of the lowest paid government workers, campaigned on a narrative of social change, including increased pensions for the elderly, educational grants for Mexico's youth and additional support for farmers.

He said he would fund his programs with the money the nation saves by eliminating corruption, a

figure he places at tens of billions of dollars a year, a windfall some experts doubt will materialize.

Realistic or not, the allure of his message is steeped in the language of nostalgia for a better time — and in a sense of economic nationalism that some fear could reverse important gains of the last 25 years.

In this way, and others, the parallels between Mr. López Obrador and President Trump are hard to ignore. Both men are tempestuous leaders, who are loath to concede a political fight. Both men lash out at enemies, and view the media with suspicion.

And even as the electoral rage propelling Mr. López Obrador's rise is largely the result of domestic issues, there will be pressure for the new president to take a less conciliatory line with his American counterpart. Mexico's current government, led by President Enrique Peña Nieto, has suffered a string of humiliations at the hands of Mr. Trump with relative silence.

But Mr. López Obrador is not the typical Latin American populist, nor does his branding as a leftist convey the complexity of his ethos.

In building his third candidacy for the presidency, he cobbled together an odd group of allies, some with contradictory visions. There are leftists, unions, far-right conservatives and endorsements from the Catholic Church. How he will manage these competing interests remains to be seen.

Mr. López Obrador will inherit an economy that has seen only modest growth over the last few decades, and one of his biggest challenges will be to convince foreign investors that Mexico will remain open for business.

If he fails to convince the markets that he is committed to continuity, or makes abrupt changes to the current economic policy, the country could find itself struggling to achieve even the modest growth of prior administrations.

There is some evidence that Mr. López Obrador knows what is at stake. Though political rivals have painted him as a radical on par with Hugo Chavez, the former socialist leader of Venezuela, Mexico's president-elect has vowed not to raise the national debt and to maintain close relations with the United States.

Mr. López Obrador, who is commonly referred to by his initials, AMLO, has a history of working with the private sector, and has appointed a respected representative to handle negotiations the North American Free Trade Agreement.

"Today AMLO is a much more moderate, centrist politician who will govern the business community with the right hand, and the social sectors and programs with the left," said Antonio Sola, who created the effective

fear campaign that branded Mr. López Obrador as a danger to Mexico in the 2006 election he lost.

"The great difference between then and now is that the dominant emotion among voters is fury," Mr. Sola said. "And anger is much stronger than fear."

On the issue of violence, Mr. López Obrador has largely failed to articulate a policy that goes much beyond platitudes. At one point, he said that amnesty for low-level offenders could be an option, as a way to end the cycle of incarceration.

When the suggestion summoned widespread criticism, he claimed the idea was merely an effort to think outside the box. But analysts say there is little that distinguishes his platform from those of other candidates, or even his predecessor, Mr. Peña Nieto.

More likely, he will find himself in the unenviable position of managing the crisis, as opposed to ending it.

Mr. Peña Nieto came to office in 2012 with a promise to bring Mexico into the 21st century, forging consensus with opposition parties to pass a slate of much needed reforms that overhauled the calcified energy, education and telecommunications sectors.

But to Mr. López Obrador, who has spent much of his political career concerned with the nation's have-nots, these reforms meant to modernize institutions trapped in the past were little more than assaults on the people.

He has promised to review the contracts for oil exploration awarded to international firms, and to respect those that are clean — and take legal measures against those that are not.

It is possible that the awarding of new contracts will cease, potentially placing Mexico's future oil exploration and production back into state hands. From there, it is unclear whether Mr. López Obrador would hand the rights back to the nation's state-run oil company, Pemex, which has suffered severe problems with corruption and inefficiency.

For many, the future of the nation's oil industry exemplifies the central concern of a López Obrador presidency: uncertainty.

For all the talk of change, many worry his presidency will be a back-to-the-future sort of moment.

"What concerns me the most about the energy and education is the ambiguity of the alternative road ahead, if he decides to roll them back," said Jesus Silva Herzog, a political-science professor at the School of Government at the Monterrey Institute of Technology and Higher Education.

Some worry about how the president-elect will handle the opposition, as his fiery personality has both delighted and concerned voters.

He has a history of ignoring his detractors, or taking them on in public ways. He refers to the nonprofit community in Mexico, which has been a force for change and democracy, as "bourgeoisie."

For his opponents, this election cycle has brought the three main parties of Mexico to a crisis point. Mr. Peña Nieto's party will be vastly reduced in size and power in the new Congress, while the leftist Party of Democratic Revolution may not even survive.

Perhaps the only party with enough power to serve as a counterweight will be the National Action Party, despite having endured a bruising split in the campaign.

On the issue of fighting graft, perhaps the signature element of his campaign, few believe that it will be easy to address the complex realities of systemic corruption.

That could set up Mr. López Obrador to be a continuation of the disappointment that so many voters are reacting to.

"The biggest problem I see are the expectations he has built," said Carlos Illades, a professor of social sciences at the Autonomous Metropolitan University and a historian of Mexico's left. "The problem is going to be what he is not able to do. There are people who are expecting a lot."

Merkel's Bavarian Allies Row Over EU Migrant Deal

By Jörn Poltz

[Reuters](#), July 1, 2018

Full-text stories from Reuters currently cannot be included in this document. You may, however, click the link above to access the story.

Future Of Germany's Angela Merkel In Question After Coalition Allies Reject Migration Deal

Christian Social Union says Friday's deal is insufficient; comments cast doubt over future of the German government

By Andrea Thomas And James Marson

[Wall Street Journal](#), July 1, 2018

Full-text stories from the Wall Street Journal are available to Journal subscribers by clicking the link.

NATIONAL NEWS

Trump: 'Big Week' Ahead With A Focus On Picking A Supreme Court Nominee

By Daniel Chaitin

[Washington Examiner](#), July 1, 2018

President Trump predicts a “big week” ahead, declaring in a tweet Sunday he will be focused on deciding who he will nominate to succeed retiring Supreme Court Justice Anthony Kennedy.

The optimistic tweet also forecast stronger economic numbers, coinciding with “exciting times for our country.”

A big week, especially with our numerous victories in the Supreme Court. Heading back to the White House now. Focus will be on the selection of a new Supreme Court Justice. Exciting times for our country. Economy may be stronger than it has ever been!— Donald J. Trump (@realDonaldTrump) July 1, 2018

Kennedy announced his retirement last week, after which the Left has raised the alarm over concerns that Trump's pick, should he or she be confirmed, could be the deciding vote in overturning Roe v. Wade, the landmark 1973 ruling that made abortion legal nationwide. Meanwhile, some moderate Republicans have emphasized they will not support a nominee who would do such a thing.

Trump said Friday he had narrowed his list of 25 candidates to five people, including two women, and that he will announce his pick on July 9.

In regards to the economy, Trump hinted in a Fox News that aired in full on Sunday that “phase two” of tax reform could be coming in October, which he hinted could include provisions that further reduce the corporate tax rate as well as emphasizing it will provide further relief to the middle class.

Trump Says Abortion Rights Could Be Decided By States

Statement points out the high stakes in the battle over replacing Supreme Court Justice Kennedy

By Stephanie Armour And Peter Nicholas
[Wall Street Journal](#), July 1, 2018

Full-text stories from the Wall Street Journal are available to Journal subscribers by clicking the link.

President Trump: I ‘Probably Won’t’ Ask Possible Supreme Court Nominees About Roe V. Wade

By Jessica Estepa
[USA Today](#), July 1, 2018

President Donald Trump said he “probably won’t” ask potential Supreme Court nominees about whether they would overturn Roe v. Wade.

“They were all saying, ‘Don’t do that...you shouldn’t do that,’” he said during an interview that aired Sunday on Fox News.

The president’s words come amid concern from abortion rights supporters that he will nominate a conservative judge who would vote to overturn the landmark case that legalized the procedure nationwide.

Trump will probably not need to ask potential nominees about their views on Roe v. Wade, the 1973 decision that legalized abortion. Most, if not all, of the potential nominees on his previously released list of candidates were vetted by the Federalist Society, a conservative legal group whose leadership disagrees with the Roe decision.

Trump’s second Supreme Court pick will replace Justice Anthony Kennedy, the Ronald Reagan appointee who has served as a swing vote on the court. Kennedy announced his retirement last week.

Trump said he plans to interview six or seven people from his candidate list and will make an announcement of his pick on July 9.

“I’m going to pick someone who is outstanding,” he said.

But the eventual nominee already faces a hurdle: Republicans hold a slim 51-49 majority in the Senate, and Sen. John McCain, R-Ariz., is out as he battles brain cancer. That means the president needs to cater to senators on both sides of the aisle if he hopes to get a majority to vote in favor of his pick.

The president told Fox News that he believes his nominee will get some support from Democrats.

Republican Sen. Susan Collins of Maine, an abortion rights supporter, is considered one of the key votes on a nominee. She said she wouldn’t vote for someone who would overturn Roe v. Wade.

“A candidate who would overturn Roe would not be acceptable,” she said Sunday on ABC’s This Week.

Collins, who has previously bucked party lines on other key issues such as health care, said she plans to have an in-depth conversation with the nominee. She emphasized that there were certain people on Trump’s candidate list that she wouldn’t vote for, though she didn’t specify who those people were.

She said she believed it would be inappropriate to ask a nominee how they would vote on a future case.

But she emphasized that they had to talk about precedent. In her view, Roe v. Wade is settled law, and she wanted someone on the court who would respect precedent.

“What I want to see is a nominee who, regardless of his or her personal views on the very difficult and contentious life issue, is going to respect precedent, regardless,” she said.

“A number of judges (have told me) that good judges are always unhappy with some of their decisions

but they make the right call regardless of their personal views. And that's what I want to see in this nominee."

Collins said she and fellow Republican Sen. Lisa Murkowski of Alaska have already spoken to the president about his pending decision.

"I got the feeling that he was still deliberating and had not yet reached a decision and that this was genuine outreach on his part," she said.

Collins noted that she was in favor of moving forward with a nominee in the next couple months, so a new justice could be in place by the time the Supreme Court's next term begins in October.

Trump: Abortion Rights 'Could Very Well End Up With States At Some Point'

By Pam Key

[Breitbart](#), July 1, 2018

On this week's broadcast of "Sunday Morning Futures," President Donald Trump hinted at the possible overturning of Roe v. Wade, saying the legality of abortion "could very well end up with states at some point."

When asked if he would ask potential nominees about Roe v. Wade, Trump said, "Well, that's a big one. And probably not. They are all saying don't do that. You don't do that. You shouldn't do that. But I'm putting conservative people on."

When asked if abortion rights should be decided by the states, Trump said, "Well, maybe someday it will be to the states. You never know how that's going to turn out. That's a very complex question. The Roe v. Wade is probably the one that people are talking about in terms of having an effect. But we will see what happens. But it could very well end up with states at some point."

Donald Trump Says Abortion Rights Could Be Left Up To States

By Alix Langone

[TIME](#), July 1, 2018

President Donald Trump acknowledged that the status of Roe v. Wade is one of the key issues in the public's mind as he nominates a replacement for Supreme Court Justice Anthony Kennedy – and said abortion rights could be left up to the states "at some point."

In an interview with Fox News host Maria Bartiromo that aired Sunday, Trump said he "probably" wouldn't ask potential nominees about their stance on Roe v. Wade, the landmark 1973 Supreme Court case that legalized abortion across America. He said he had been advised not to.

However, he vowed, "but I'm putting conservative people on."

When asked whether abortion rights could be left up to the states – something that would require Roe v. Wade to be overturned – Trump said: "Maybe some day it will be to the states, you never know how that's going to turn out. That's a very complex question."

"The Roe v. Wade is probably the one that people are talking about in terms of having an effect. But we'll see what happens, but it could very well end up with states at some point."

Abortion rights supporters and opponents alike believe the retirement of Kennedy – a swing vote on the court who has consistently upheld the Roe v. Wade precedent – could mark a turning point for the case. If the ruling were overturned, states could potentially opt to ban abortion entirely or place even greater restrictions on access.

The interview touched on many other hot button political issues, including the controversial policies U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) is helping to enforce at the U.S.-Mexico Border. Trump brought up Democratic Congresswoman Maxine Waters, who he previously said on Twitter has threatened his supporters, saying he thinks Democrats will "get beaten so badly" in upcoming elections because some party leaders are calling for the abolishment of ICE.

"All [abolishing ICE is] going to do is lead to massive, massive crime," he said. "That's going to be their platform, open borders which equals crime. I think they'll never win another election. So I'm actually quite happy about it."

Bartiromo also asked Trump about his reaction to Harley Davidson's announcement that it cannot afford to continue manufacturing all of its motorcycles in this country. The company claimed retaliatory tariffs being imposed on the U.S. by the European Union due to Trump's trade war make it too expensive.

"I think that Harley is an American bike. It's an American motorcycle and they should build them in this country," the president said. "I guarantee you everybody that ever bought a Harley Davidson voted for Trump... and they're very unhappy about it."

Donald Trump: States May Decide Abortion Rights, 'Honored' Kennedy Retired During His Presidency

By Benjamin Fearnow

[Newsweek](#), July 1, 2018

President Donald Trump said his pick for Supreme Court justice could ultimately see the Roe v. Wade ruling

on abortion rights decided on a state-by-state basis—something that requires it to be overturned.

Trump told Fox News' Maria Bartiromo he was "honored" that Justice Anthony Kennedy announced his retirement and personally handed him a letter notifying the president he'd be able to nominate the next SCOTUS appointee. Trump described Kennedy as a "great gentleman" who "ended up being a little more neutral than a lot of people would have preferred." Kennedy was sworn in as a Supreme Court justice in February 1988 after being nominated by a fellow Republican, President Ronald Reagan.

Fox News' Bartiromo asked Trump whether he will ask nominees beforehand about their stances on potentially overturning the landmark 1973 Roe v. Wade decision on abortion and women's reproductive rights across the country. A stammering Trump responded, "Well, that's a big one. And probably not. They are all saying don't do that. You don't do that. You shouldn't do that. But I'm putting conservative people on."

Trump added that he's "very proud" of Neil Gorsuch, who was nominated by the president to replace the late Antonin Scalia in 2017. Trump said Gorsuch's opinions are "so well-written, so brilliant." He was also "honored" that Kennedy chose to retire during his presidency—"which means he had confidence in me to do the right thing," Trump added.

Trump hesitantly added, however, that he's not going to be "so specific with the questions" used to query his SCOTUS pick, and especially not in regards to Roe v. Wade. Trump said he's "been told" he shouldn't be so narrow in his questions, something Bartiromo tied to his 2016 campaign trail promises that he'd "leave it to the states."

Trump was pressed on his view of abortion, women's reproductive rights and restrictions being decided on a state basis, not federal. "Well, maybe someday it will be to the states. You never know how that's going to turn out. That's a very complex question. The Roe v. Wade is probably the one that people are talking about in terms of having an effect. But we will see what happens. But it could very well end up with states at some point."

Trump said he plans to have his pick for the Supreme Court in place before the upcoming 2018 midterm elections in November. Trump said he thinks the process will "go very quickly" and he's counting on support from Democrats. But he said the only thing some people "on the other side" want to do is "resist" everything he does in office. Trump did not rule out there will be some "vicious" attacks against his appointee.

The January 22, 1973, Roe v. Wade ruling saw the 7-2 majority vote in favor of Roe. The ruling made

abortion a fundamental right under the U.S. Constitution, and thereby subjected all laws attempting to restrict it to the highest standard of strict scrutiny. A 1992 ruling in Roe v. Wade and Planned Parenthood v. Casey reaffirmed the federal, constitutional right to have an abortion under 14th Amendment guarantees to women's health.

Trump: I'm Told I Shouldn't Ask My SCOTUS Nominee About Roe V. Wade

By Michael Walsh Reporterreporter

[Yahoo! News](#), July 1, 2018

Supreme Court candidates about their opinions on abortion before nominating Justice Anthony M. Kennedy's replacement." data-reactid="22">President Trump said he probably won't ask potential Supreme Court candidates about their opinions on abortion before nominating Justice Anthony M. Kennedy's replacement.

Roe v. Wade, the landmark Supreme Court decision affirming that the constitutional right to privacy extends to a woman's decision to have an abortion." data-reactid="23">In a program that aired Sunday morning, Fox News journalist Maria Bartiromo asked Trump if he would ask his nominees beforehand how they might vote on Roe v. Wade, the landmark Supreme Court decision affirming that the constitutional right to privacy extends to a woman's decision to have an abortion.

Trump responded that he's been advised not to ask such specific questions and that he plans to appoint another conservative justice like Neil Gorsuch, whom Trump appointed to replace Antonin Scalia.

"Well, that's a big one and probably not. They're all saying, 'Don't do that. You don't do that. You shouldn't do that.' But I'm putting conservative people on and I'm very proud of Neil Gorsuch. He's been outstanding. His opinions are you know so well written, so brilliant. And I'm going to try and do something like that but I don't think I'm going to be so specific in the questions I'll be asking. And I'm actually told I shouldn't be," Trump said on "Sunday Morning Futures With Maria Bartiromo."

Bartiromo reminded Trump that during his 2016 presidential campaign he said the issue of abortion should be left to the states.

"Maybe someday it will be to the states. You never know how that's going to turn out. That's a very complex question. [Roe v. Wade] is probably the one that people are talking about in terms of having an effect. But we'll see what happens. But it could very well end up with states at some point."

fear from liberals and hope from conservatives. Trump's replacement is expected to shift the court's

ideological balance to the right, which could shape the country's judicial future for generations to come. Republicans currently control the Senate, which can confirm Trump's nominee with a simple majority, but this could change with the midterm elections." data-reactid="28">Kennedy's retirement on Thursday elicited fear from liberals and hope from conservatives. Trump's replacement is expected to shift the court's ideological balance to the right, which could shape the country's judicial future for generations to come. Republicans currently control the Senate, which can confirm Trump's nominee with a simple majority, but this could change with the midterm elections.

Bartiromo asked Trump if he thinks his nominee will be in place before the midterm elections.

President Trump, center, speaks during a lunch meeting with Republican lawmakers at White House, June 26, 2018. (Photo: Al Drago/Bloomberg via Getty Images)More

the right person. I'm going to pick the right person. I'm going to pick somebody that's outstanding. And everybody on that list is outstanding, but I'm going to pick somebody who's outstanding. And I think yes, I think we're going to go very quickly." "I think it's going to go very quickly. I think we're going to have a lot of support. I think we're going to have support from Democrats, frankly, I think if it's the right person. I'm going to pick the right person. I'm going to pick somebody that's outstanding. And everybody on that list is outstanding, but I'm going to pick somebody who's outstanding. And I think yes, I think we're going to go very quickly."

Despite this optimism, Trump said the path toward confirmation will probably be "vicious" because all the liberals can do is "obstruct and resist."

resist. And maybe someday we'll be able to get along with the other side. I don't know. But right now it's only resist. That's all they want to do is stop things from happening, so they're going to try very hard." data-reactid="43">"You know, their whole thing is resist. And maybe someday we'll be able to get along with the other side. I don't know. But right now it's only resist. That's all they want to do is stop things from happening, so they're going to try very hard."

CNN's "State of the Union," Sen. Susan Collins, R-Maine, said she would not support a nominee who demonstrated hostility toward Roe v. Wade because that would mean his or her judicial philosophy didn't have respect for established decisions, which she considers a "fundamental tenet of our judicial system." During an appearance on CNN's "State of the Union," Sen. Susan Collins, R-Maine, said she would not support a nominee who demonstrated hostility toward Roe v. Wade because that would mean his or her judicial philosophy didn't

have respect for established decisions, which she considers a "fundamental tenet of our judicial system."

When asked if it's fair to expect that any of Trump's nominees would vote to overthrow Roe v. Wade, Collins said that Trump assured her he would not ask that question of his nominees.

"Well, the president told me in our meeting that he would not ask that question. And that is what he has most recently said, on the advice of his attorney. So, I think what he said as the candidate may not have been informed by the legal advice that he now has, that it would be inappropriate for him to ask a nominee how he or she would rule on a specific issue."

Trump Says His U.S. Supreme Court Pick Will Be 'Outstanding'

By Jonathan D. Salant

[NJ News](#), July 1, 2018

President Donald Trump said he will choose an "outstanding" person for the U.S. Supreme Court and said he expected the Senate to quickly confirm his choice.

"I think it's going to go very quickly," Trump said Sunday in a Fox News interview. "I think we'll have a lot of support. I'm going to pick somebody that's outstanding, I think we will go very quickly."

The retirement of Justice Anthony Kennedy, the swing vote on a number of contentious issues, gave Trump an opportunity to tilt the high court far to the right.

7 big ways union ruling will affect N.J.

Trump has pledged to nominate justices who will overturn Roe v. Wade, the landmark Supreme Court decision that legalized abortion, and said he would choose from a list of people vetted by the Federalist Society, a conservative legal group that opposes abortion.

So he already knows how anyone on the list will vote on abortion, meaning he doesn't have to ask their views on the issue.

"I don't think I'm going to be so specific in the questions I'll be asking," Trump told Fox. "I'm actually told that I shouldn't be."

With just a 51-49 Republican majority in the Senate, Trump can lose just two lawmakers, and one of the GOP senators, U.S. Sen. Susan Collins said a nominee's position on the abortion decision will be crucial to her vote.

"I would not support a nominee who demonstrated hostility to Roe v. Wade, because that would mean to me that their judicial philosophy did not include a respect for established decisions, established law," Collins, R-Maine, said on CNN's "State of the Union."

Trump's last nominee, Justice Neil Gorsuch, was confirmed only after Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell, R-Ky., broke with long-standing precedent and refused to consider President Barack Obama's court pick, and then unilaterally changed the rules to prevent Senate Democrats from filibustering future nominees.

Gorsuch was one of the five justices voting to overturn 40 years of established law and prevent public employee unions from charging fees to non-members to cover the cost of representation. The decision targeted organized labor, which has primarily has supported Democrats.

He also cast the deciding vote when the Supreme Court upheld Trump's ban on immigration from several Muslim-majority nations.

Had Trump not been able to nominate Gorsuch, "they would have all been reversed," he said. "Those decisions would have all gone the other way."

Trump Judicial Adviser: No Top Supreme Court Candidates 'Have Clear Position' On Roe V. Wade

By Joe Williams

[Washington Examiner](#), July 1, 2018

A top Trump judicial adviser on Sunday said none of the reportedly top individuals on the administration's shortlist of candidates to replace retiring Supreme Court Justice Anthony Kennedy have a clear position on whether to overturn a key abortion ruling.

Democrats are spurring concerns that President Trump will appoint a justice to the nation's top court that will seek to overturn Roe v. Wade, the landmark 1973 ruling that made abortion legal nationwide. Trump is planning to announce his candidate on July 9 and Senate Republican leaders are hoping to confirm the pick before the first week in October.

The White House is tapping into the same shortlist updated in November for its nomination to fill Kennedy's seat and several of the candidates have expressed strong pro-life views. But Leonard Leo, the vice president of the Federalist Society and a Trump judicial adviser, said none "have a clear position on Roe v. Wade."

"Prospective nominees like Brett Kavanaugh, and Amy Barrett, and Raymond Kethledge, and Tom Hardiman are people who have not specifically said they oppose Roe v. Wade, and their writings and their work show that they are very fair," he told Fox News. "They look at arguments from both sides all the time and they analyze them very carefully, and when they take a position, they then say these are what the other people have said about this and here's why I don't agree with them."

Leo said none of the candidates he mentioned are necessarily front-runners, but strongly defended their credentials. Pressed on whether circuit court judge Kavanaugh's view that presidents are exempt from outside investigations disqualifies him, Leo said his past comments show Kavanaugh respects "the limits on government power in the Constitution, which includes the separation of powers."

Trump is facing a lawsuit alleging that his non-profit charity violated campaign finance laws and inappropriately coordinated with his presidential campaign, among other things. Special counsel Robert Mueller's investigation into Russian meddling in the 2016 election and whether the Trump campaign colluded with the Kremlin also remains ongoing.

Trump's Judicial Adviser Names Four Potential Supreme Court Nominees

By Andrew Kugle

[Washington Free Beacon](#), July 1, 2018

Leonard Leo, executive vice president of the Federalist Society and outside adviser to President Donald Trump for judicial nominations, named four potential Supreme Court nominees on Fox News Sunday.

Fox News Sunday host Chris Wallace asked Leo about the upcoming confirmation battle for the next Supreme Court justice and if the nominee has past views or writings expressing hostility towards the abortion ruling of Roe v. Wade that their nomination could face opposition from some Republican senators.

"One of the few ways that a Trump nominee could fail to be confirmed is if you get one of the two — here they are on the screen, if you lose one of the two Republican senators, Susan Collins or Lisa Murkowski, were both pro-choice. Is it fair to say that the president won't pick someone who has a record of opposition to Roe v. Wade?" Wallace asked.

"I think Senator Collins made the point very clearly. She wants someone who's going to adhere to the constitution and the law more than anything else," Leo responded.

"She also said that it's a firm precedent. If you have somebody who has a record, for instance William Pryor, that it was an abomination, Roe v. Wade, that's clearly going to set off alarm bells," Wallace said. "It would be fair to say the president is not going to pick somebody who has a clear record of opposition to Roe v. Wade?"

"None of the people who are being talked about now in the public space in the media are people who have a clear position on Roe v. Wade. The most

important thing here is a record showing fairness, someone who listens very carefully to arguments on both sides,” Leo said. “Someone who tries to keep an open mind and perspective nominees like Brett Kavanaugh, Amy Barrett, Raymond Kethledge and Thomas Hardiman are people who have not specifically said they oppose Roe vs. Wade and their writings and their work show that they are very fair.”

All four names Leo mentioned are on Trump’s list of potential Supreme Court justices.

Wallace asked if it was fair to say if the four people are the front runners in the search to replace Justice Anthony Kennedy.

“No, I don’t think it’s fair to say that, and here’s why. The president is really in the driver’s seat along with the assistance of White House counsel Don McGahn. Those are people who are under very serious consideration, two of them as you know are people who throw the process to some extent,” Leo said.

He added how Kavanaugh and Barrett have gone through a vetting and confirmation process already by the White House.

“And then Brett Kavanaugh is one of the most distinguished jurists in America,” Leo said. “He has over 300 opinions. He is respected by both sides on the political and ideological spectrum and Barrett, similarly is one of the most talented and distinguished women in the legal academy anywhere in the country. Former law clerk to Justice Scalia. As someone who, again, people across the spectrum greatly admire.”

Kennedy announced last week that he would retire, effective July 31, giving Trump the opportunity to make two appointments in two years to the nation’s highest court. The vacancy sets up a bitter confirmation fight right before the midterm elections, where Republicans only have a single vote majority in the Senate. Despite the slim majority, Senate Republicans only need a 51-vote majority to confirm the Supreme Court nominee after Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell (R., Ky.) changed the rules to allow it in the case of Supreme Court justice confirmations. McConnell’s move followed the precedent set by former Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D., Nev.) when he eliminated the filibuster for judicial nominees and presidential appointments back in 2013.

Bulwark Against An Abortion Ban? Medical Advances

By Pam Belluck And Jan Hoffman
[New York Times](#), July 1, 2018

As partisans on both sides of the abortion divide contemplate a Supreme Court with two Trump

appointees, one thing is certain: America even without legal abortion would be very different from America before abortion was legal.

The moment Justice Anthony M. Kennedy announced his retirement, speculation swirled that Roe v. Wade, the landmark 1973 ruling that legalized abortion, would be overturned. Most legal experts say that day is years away, if it arrives at all. A more likely scenario, they predict, is that a rightward-shifting court would uphold efforts to restrict abortion, which would encourage some states to further limit access.

Even then, a full-fledged return to an era of back-alley, coat-hanger abortions seems improbable. In the decades since Roe was decided, a burst of scientific innovation has produced more effective, simpler and safer ways to prevent pregnancies and to stop them after conception — advances that have contributed to an abortion rate that has already plunged by half since the 1980s.

“We’re in a new world now,” said Aziza Ahmed, a law professor at Northeastern University who writes about reproductive rights law. “The majority of American women are on some form of contraception. We take it for granted that we can control when and how we want to reproduce. We see pregnancy as within the realm that we can control.”

Women have powerful tools at hand: improved intrauterine devices and hormonal implants that can prevent pregnancy for years at a time; inexpensive home pregnancy tests able to detect pregnancy very early; and morning-after pills, some even available over the counter, which can prevent pregnancy if taken up to five days after unprotected sex.

Medication abortions enable women up to 10 weeks pregnant to take two pills, the first supervised by a doctor and the second at home, to terminate a pregnancy without surgery. In 2013, nearly a quarter of abortions were accomplished with medication, up from 10 percent in 2004. Even in countries that have banned virtually all abortions, including some in Latin America, women have managed to get these drugs from websites and abortion rights organizations that ship them.

And the Affordable Care Act, which has so far defied repeated repeal attempts, has made birth control available to poor and working-class women, and also to those with private coverage through employers, with its requirement that most insurers cover the full cost of contraception. Apps and telemedicine services are making birth control pills and other methods available without even a visit to a doctor.

Still, legal changes that make abortion less available would have profound effects on millions of women, disproportionately affecting African-Americans,

Latinas and women struggling economically. And access to contraception can be problematic for low-income single women in the 19 states, including Texas and Florida, that have still not expanded Medicaid coverage for poor single adults.

Despite the new drugs and technologies, nearly half of all pregnancies in the United States are unintended, a higher rate than in many other developed countries.

A report this year by a committee of the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering and Medicine found that three-quarters of women who have abortions are poor or low-income, and 61 percent are women of color. Such women bear the brunt of state laws that restrict abortion, including those requiring multiple appointments or waiting periods or that limit which providers can perform abortions.

Such hurdles and delays could eventually threaten the consistently high level of safety in abortion procedures, experts said. "We found that more and more regulations on abortion and abortion procedures reduced the quality of care," said the committee's co-chairwoman, Dr. Helene Gayle, president and chief executive of the Chicago Community Trust.

"The people most impacted are the immigrant women already under siege, low-income women, women of color, transgender and queer women," said Jessica González-Rojas, executive director of the National Latina Institute for Reproductive Health, which works with women in the Rio Grande Valley in Texas. "Having a Supreme Court friendly to these restrictive laws makes it a de facto ban on that kind of health care, abortion and contraception. Legal access without real access is not access at all."

In some states, though, the impact of anti-abortion laws can be hard to measure. A recent report on 2014 data by the Guttmacher Institute, a research group that supports abortion rights, found that while the national abortion rate had reached its lowest since the Roe v. Wade decision, the rate rose modestly in six states — five of which had introduced restrictive abortion laws.

The report also found that in states where the number of abortion clinics had increased, women were not necessarily having more abortions. New Jersey went from having 24 clinics in 2011 to 41 in 2014, but abortions declined from about 47,000 to about 44,000 during that time.

Overall, abortion rates have declined almost steadily since 1981, when the rate was 29.3 per 1,000 women. In 2014, there were an estimated 926,200 abortions — a rate of 14.6 per 1,000 women, ages 15 to 44.

When abortion was outlawed, initially by state laws in the 19th century, women still managed to obtain them, sometimes with doctors or midwives, sometimes with unlicensed abortionists.

"Making abortions illegal didn't stop them ever," said Linda Gordon, a professor of history at New York University.

The so-called Comstock obscenity laws, passed from 1873 through the early 1900s, made it illegal to give, sell, mail or transport any item used for contraception or abortion.

After that, "Margaret Sanger built a movement by compromising," Dr. Gordon said. "They would campaign for legalization of contraception but not abortion."

Even after the birth control pill went on the market in 1960, contraceptives were only provided to women who were married. "When I was in college, there was a wedding ring that was shared among young women when they wanted to see a doctor to get contraception," Dr. Gordon said.

Abortions were often arranged through networks of clergy or women who helped people find, travel to and pay for providers.

Johanna Schoen, a professor at Rutgers University in New Brunswick, N.J., who specializes in the history of women's reproductive health, said the fate and rate of abortion will be intertwined with the availability of contraception, and whether anti-abortion political forces also take aim at birth control.

Professor Schoen said many European countries have low abortion rates because birth control and sex education are widely available. "But in the United States, the same people who are trying to restrict abortions have tried to restrict contraception, too."

Carol Sanger, who teaches reproductive rights at Columbia Law School, predicts that the Supreme Court won't overrule Roe v. Wade anytime soon. Developing a case that would be a direct assault takes years, she said.

"You don't say, 'Kennedy's out, Roe's overturned,'" Ms. Sanger said.

The doctrine of precedent, known as *stare decisis*, "to stand by things decided," is sturdy. Circumstances must be extraordinary, a law unworkable, for a court to overrule itself, Ms. Sanger said. "It stands for the idea that the substance of our law doesn't blow back and forth just because we get a new administration."

Another reason Roe v. Wade may not be struck down? "You can do a heck of a lot of damage without overturning it," she said.

In the 45 years since the ruling, anti-abortion activists have largely focused on lobbying state legislatures for laws that delay or limit access to

abortion, including mandating parental notification by teenagers, longer waiting periods, and strict requirements for clinics.

Among such initiatives, said Susan Swayze Liebel of the Susan B. Anthony List, an anti-abortion organization, "fetal pain" laws have become a "top priority." Some 20 states have enacted these laws, which assert that a fetus can feel pain at 20 weeks after conception — a claim refuted by most medical experts.

Roe barred most legal restrictions on abortions until fetuses were considered able to survive outside the womb, believed then to be 24 weeks after a woman's last menstrual period (about 22 weeks after conception). These laws seek to shorten abortion deadlines by two weeks, and while more than 90 percent of abortions occur much earlier, in the first trimester, fetal pain laws serve as potent political rallying cries.

Numerous lawsuits about abortion restrictions are currently in state and federal courts, primed to wound Roe with a thousand cuts.

Like the fetal pain laws, the intention of one such category is to roll back viability dates, which goes to the heart of Roe. Iowa just enacted a law banning most abortions after six weeks, when a fetal heartbeat can be detected. Mississippi recently passed a ban on abortions after 15 weeks. Abortion providers swiftly sued after the laws were passed. Legislators who sponsored the laws said they relished such court clashes, hoping to reach the Supreme Court.

Another category is TRAP laws: targeted regulation of abortion providers. An Arkansas law, for example, requires providers of medication abortions to have a contract with an obstetrician/gynecologist with hospital admitting privileges. The Supreme Court declined to consider an appeal by the plaintiffs, Planned Parenthood of Arkansas and Eastern Oklahoma, of an appellate court ruling that upheld the law. The clinics say finding such doctors who will work with them has been impossible. The case is back in federal court, where a judge has blocked the law until July 2. If the law takes effect, Arkansas will likely lose two of its three clinics.

Another cluster of laws aims to limit abortions based on possible reasons for having them, including sex selection and fetal diagnoses of conditions such as Down syndrome. Indiana's version, signed by then-Governor Mike Pence in 2016, was recently struck down by the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, 2-1.

As abortion court battles unfold, both sides say they will redouble their political efforts. Noting that the Senate this year did not pass a 20-week abortion ban, Mrs. Liebel of Susan B. Anthony's List said, "The focus

for our political activity is to go door-to-door in seven states and flip some key Senate seats to be pro-life."

And Nancy Northup, president and chief executive of the Center for Reproductive Rights, which focuses on laws concerning reproductive freedom, noted that some eight states have enshrined the right to abortion, should Roe fall. "So we are also looking at advocacy alternatives, such as friendlier state laws and federal legislation to protect women's health," she said.

Evangelical Leaders Downplay Potential Roe V. Wade Reversal

By Harrisburg (PA) Patriot-News

[Harrisburg \(PA\) Patriot-News](#), June 30, 2018

For evangelical Christian leaders like Jerry Falwell Jr., this is their political holy grail.

Like many religious conservatives in a position to know, the Liberty University president with close ties to the White House suspects that the Supreme Court vacancy President Donald Trump fills in the coming months will ultimately lead to the reversal of the landmark abortion case Roe v. Wade.

But instead of celebrating publicly, some evangelical leaders are downplaying their fortune on an issue that has defined their movement for decades.

"What people don't understand is that if you overturn Roe v. Wade, all that does is give the states the right to decide whether abortion is legal or illegal," Falwell told The Associated Press in an interview. "My guess is that there'd probably be less than 20 states that would make abortion illegal if given that right."

Falwell added: "In the '70s, I don't know how many states had abortion illegal before Roe v. Wade, but it won't be near as many this time."

The sentiment, echoed by evangelical leaders across the country this past week, underscores the delicate politics that surround a moment many religious conservatives have longed for.

With the retirement of swing vote Supreme Court Justice Anthony Kennedy, Trump and his Republican allies in the Senate plan to install a conservative justice who could re-define the law of the land on some of the nation's most explosive policy debates — none bigger than abortion.

And while these are the very best of times for the religious right, social conservatives risk a powerful backlash from their opponents if they cheer too loudly. Women's groups have already raised the alarm for their constituents, particularly suburban women, who are poised to play an outsized role in the fight for the House majority this November.

Two-thirds of Americans do not want to see *Roe v. Wade* overturned, according to a poll released Friday by the nonpartisan Kaiser Family Foundation. Among women of reproductive age, three out of four want the high court ruling left alone. The poll was conducted before Kennedy's retirement was announced.

"The left is going to try very hard to say this is all about overturning *Roe*," said Johnnie Moore, a Southern Baptist minister who was a co-chairman of the Trump campaign's evangelical advisory board. The more significant shift on the high court, he said, would likely be the help given to conservatives in their fight for what they call religious freedom.

Tony Perkins, who leads the socially conservative Family Research Council, said abortion was simply "a factor" in evangelicals' excitement over a more conservative Supreme Court. He suggested that public opinion was already shifting against abortion rights, although that's not true of the *Roe v. Wade* ruling, which has become slightly more popular over time.

Perkins agreed with Moore that the broader push for religious freedom was a bigger conservative focus.

Many evangelicals, for example, have lashed out against Obama-era laws that required churches and other religious institutions to provide their employees with women's reproductive services, including access to abortion and birth control.

Others have rallied behind private business owners who faced legal repercussions after denying services to gay people.

Yet sweeping restrictions to abortion rights are certainly on the table, Moore noted.

"There is a high level of confidence within the community that overturning *Roe* is actually, finally possible," Moore said. He added: "Evangelicals have never been more confident in the future of America than they are now. It's just a fact."

In Alabama, Tom Parker, a Republican associate justice on the state Supreme Court who is campaigning to become the state's chief justice, explicitly raised the potential of sending cases to Washington that would lead to the overturning of key rulings, including *Roe v. Wade*.

"President Trump is just one appointment away from giving us a conservative majority on the U.S. Supreme Court," Parker said in an interview on the radio program *Wallbuilders Live*. "And they are going to need cases that they can use to reverse those horrible decisions of the liberal majority in the past that have undermined the Constitution and really just abused our own personal rights."

Despite Trump's struggles with Christian values in his personal life at times, skeptical evangelical Christians

lined up behind him in the 2016 election, and they remain one of his most loyal constituencies.

The president's standing with white evangelical Christians hit an all-time high in April when 75 percent of evangelicals held a favorable view of Trump, according to a poll conducted by the Public Religion Research Institute.

The unlikely marriage between the thrice-married president and Christian conservatives has always been focused on Trump's ability to re-shape the nation's judicial branch.

On the day she endorsed candidate Trump in March 2016, the late iconic anti-abortion activist Phyllis Schlafly first asked him privately whether he would appoint more judges like the conservative Antonin Scalia, recalled Schlafly's successor Ed Martin, who was in the room at the time. Trump promised he would.

The president followed through with the appointment of Neil Gorsuch less than a month after his inauguration, delighting religious conservatives nationwide. And the Trump White House, while disorganized in other areas, made its relationship with the religious right a priority.

The first private White House meeting between evangelical leaders and senior Trump officials came in the days after the Gorsuch nomination, said Moore, who was in attendance. He said the White House has hosted roughly two dozen similar meetings since then in the Eisenhower Executive Office Building adjacent to the White House.

A senior administration official such as Jared Kushner, Ivanka Trump or Kellyanne Conway – if not Trump himself – has always been present, Moore added. Each meeting featured a detailed briefing on the administration's push to fill judicial openings.

"The courts have been at the very center of the relationship," Moore said.

And now, as the focus shifts toward the president's next Supreme Court nomination, evangelical leaders who once held their noses and voted for Trump have little doubt he will pick someone who shares their conservative views on abortion, same-sex marriage and other social issues.

Falwell insisted only that Trump make his next selection from the list of prospective nominees he released before his election. All are believed to oppose the *Roe v. Wade* ruling.

Any deviation from the list, Falwell said, would be "a betrayal." He noted, however, that he's in weekly contact with the White House and has supreme confidence that the president will deliver.

"This is a vindication for the 80 percent of evangelicals who supported Trump. Many of them voted

on this issue alone,” Falwell said. “Today’s a day that we as evangelicals, and really all average Americans, can say we told you so.”

This Is The Fight Of Our Lives. Here’s How We Win It.

By E.j. Dionne Jr.

[Washington Post](#), July 1, 2018

BOSTON

When Supreme Court Justice Anthony M. Kennedy announced his retirement, Sen. Elizabeth Warren (D-Mass.) quickly tweeted: “This is the fight of our lives.”

She’s right. But how will the fight be defined, and how can it be won?

With Republicans in control of the Senate, the odds favor anyone President Trump picks to fill Kennedy’s seat. But as the mass mobilization to preserve the Affordable Care Act demonstrated, progressives can win battles in the Senate if Democrats hold together, and if a handful of Republicans are convinced that going along with their party will have high political and substantive costs. There is no choice but to mobilize.

Supporters of abortion rights were among the earliest to speak out forcefully against a right-wing nomination from Trump — and his list of possible choices includes only right-wingers. The abortion question takes on a special urgency because Kennedy, while deeply conservative in so many areas, was a relative moderate on social issues. A harder-line conservative could join with the other four conservatives on the court to overturn or substantially roll back *Roe v. Wade*.

Moderate and liberal voters who had not weighed court appointments heavily in their ballot-box decisions may do so now that the threat to *Roe* is not theoretical but real. This could also further boost turnout among women strongly opposed to Trump, whom Democrats are counting on this November.

More immediately, Sens. Susan Collins (R-Maine) and Lisa Murkowski (R-Alaska) will be crucial to stopping a Trump nominee, or at least delaying a vote until after the election. Both support abortion rights, and both played important roles in saving the ACA. The pressure on them will be immense.

But for Collins and Murkowski to make a difference, Democratic senators will have to stay united, and opposing a Trump pick could be difficult for those on the ballot this fall in pro-Trump states. That’s particularly true of three who voted to confirm Justice Neil M. Gorsuch and who, along with Collins and Murkowski, met with Trump last week: Joe Donnelly of Indiana, Heidi

Heitkamp of North Dakota and Joe Manchin III of West Virginia.

They need to be prepared to make a broader argument about how the lives of the people they represent will be affected by the radical nature of conservative jurisprudence.

It would use states’ rights and other doctrines to invalidate environmental, economic and social legislation. With abortion often at the forefront, it’s easy to overlook the judicial right’s goal of bringing the country back to the pre-New Deal days. That’s when justices relied on strict interpretations of property and contract rights — and a narrow view of federal authority — to strike down laws on wages, hours and other forms of business regulation.

As Duke University law professor Jedediah Purdy noted in the *New York Times*, “What is at stake is whether American democracy can overcome the new Gilded Age of inequality and insecurity.”

Senators such as Donnelly, Heitkamp and Manchin need to argue to those who are ambivalent about abortion, or even against it, that right-wing judges would sanction a plutocratic government with little capacity to defend their interests.

In framing their appeal, they might revisit a series of speeches underscoring the threat of conservative legal thinking given by former vice president Joe Biden in 2000, when he was a senator.

“The Supreme Court, in case after case, is freely imposing its own view of sound public policy — not constitutional law, but public policy,” Biden told me at the time. “What is at issue here is a question of power, whether power will be exercised by an insulated judiciary or by the elected representatives of the people.”

Speaking on the Senate floor, Biden acknowledged that the phrase “judicial activism” has “often been used by conservatives to criticize liberal judges.” But “the shoe is plainly on the other foot: It is now conservative judges who are supplanting the judgment of the people’s representatives and substituting their own.”

Sen. Chris Murphy (D-Conn.) showed how this larger point can be made in his initial response to Kennedy’s retirement. “The existing Court’s assault on voting rights, collective bargaining and religious liberty is awful enough — just imagine how bad working people will have it if another right-wing justice joins the Court.” He warned of the court “taking a vicious, anti-worker, anti-women, anti-LGBT, anti-civil rights turn.”

The future of abortion rights is central to the coming battle. But so are civil rights, corporate power and our democratic capacity to correct social injustices. Conservatives should not be allowed to distract attention

from the aspects of their agenda that would horrify even many who voted for Donald Trump.

After Eyeing The Exits, White House Officials Will Likely Stay Through Supreme Court Confirmation: Sources

By Tara Palmeri

[ABC News](#), July 1, 2018

Top White House officials worn out from the chaos of the Trump administration and eyeing the exits in the coming weeks are now considering staying on through the confirmation of a Supreme Court justice, three White House officials and two outside advisors tell ABC News.

White House counsel Don McGahn, Legislative Affairs director Marc Short and Domestic Policy director Andrew Bremberg have told colleagues in the days following Supreme Court Justice Kennedy's retirement announcement that they plan to stay on staff through the confirmation process.

McGahn, who has had a frayed relationship with the president and has signaled his desire to leave, told his staff last week that he plans to stay on through the midterm elections, according to two White House officials. His team will be taking the lead on the confirmation process, the sources said.

"He's excited for it. This is what he's been working for all along," said a senior White House official.

Bremberg has also told colleagues about his plans to resign, but in recent days has said he's leaning toward staying. It's unclear if his decision is directly related to the Supreme Court process, which he'll be assisting in a minor role.

Short, who signaled to staffers that he would be exiting in the coming weeks, is now expected to stay on until October 1 to help coordinate with Senate offices, according to multiple White House officials.

While declining to comment on his status, Short explained how he thinks the confirmation process will roll out.

"It's kind of like domino. In July we'll be making sure the proper papers were assembled that senators will ask for, and then in August we will be consumed with individual meetings," Short said. "Hopefully them being here in August – we'd like to assume the hearing by the end of the summer.

"We're trying to aim to have the new court in place by November 1," he added.

Kennedy announced his resignation last week. With a razor-thin majority in the Senate, Republicans are under pressure to have a Court Justice confirmed before the midterm elections.

The confirmation process is expected to be heated, especially after Republicans denied Obama's nominee, Merrick Garland, a vote following the death of Justice Antonin Scalia in 2016.

Gearing up for a fight, President Trump told Fox News on Sunday, "It's probably going to be vicious because the other side, all they can do obstruct and resist."

To speed up the process, President Trump has enlisted the help of Leonard Leo, executive vice president of the Federalist Society, to draft a list of 25 potential nominees, who have already been vetted.

Trump told reporters on Friday that he's already down to five candidates and would be announcing his Supreme Court pick on July 9. A source close to the selection process said the president said he would be meeting in person with his top five candidates this week.

"I think it's going to go very quickly. I think we're going to have a lot of support," Trump said in the Fox News interview.

The White House has suffered from a slew of staff departures. The Brookings Institute said that President Trump has had more turnover in his first year than the past five presidents.

Deputy Chief of Staff Joe Hagin is expected to depart this week.

While facing this uphill confirmation battle, the president's relationship with chief of staff John Kelly remains tense.

Trump has described Kelly's departure as "imminent" to staffers, according to sources. But some White House officials suspect that the beleaguered chief of staff may stay on for one more political win "out of duty for his country," sources say.

"When John Kelly leaves he wants the world to know it's his choice, not the way Reince [Priebus] or [Rob] Porter left," the senior White House official said, referring to the former chief of staff and the White House secretary, respectively.

Kelly has told colleagues, "I want to get to my one year and then we'll see," the official said.

Kelly, who initially served the administration as its secretary of Homeland Security, became chief of staff in late July 2017.

When asked how long Kelly will stay on staff, Trump only said, "That I don't know. I can't tell you that, but I can say that we've had a very good relationship. We've achieved a lot together."

While Trump also frequently griped about Priebus, he did credit him with the successful confirmation of Supreme Court Justice Neil Gorsuch, according to former White House officials.

A White House spokesperson declined to comment.

Senator Collins Will Not Back Anti-abortion Supreme Court Nominee

By Lindsay Dunsmuir

[Reuters](#), July 1, 2018

Full-text stories from Reuters currently cannot be included in this document. You may, however, click the link above to access the story.

Susan Collins, Pivotal Moderate, Says 'Hostility' To Roe Would Sway Her Vote

By Nicholas Fandos And Emily Cochrane

[New York Times](#), July 1, 2018

Senator Susan Collins, a moderate Maine Republican whose vote could prove decisive in filling the Supreme Court's vacant seat, said on Sunday that she would not vote for a nominee who showed "hostility" toward *Roe v. Wade*, the landmark 1973 decision establishing a constitutional right to abortion.

"A candidate for this important position who would overturn *Roe v. Wade* would not be acceptable to me, because that would indicate an activist agenda that I don't want to see a judge have," Ms. Collins said on ABC's "This Week."

In another interview on Sunday, on CNN's "State of the Union," the senator said such a decision "would mean to me their judicial philosophy did not include a respect for established decisions, established law."

"And I believe that that is the very important fundamental tenet of our judicial system, which, as Chief Justice Roberts says, helps to promote stability and even handedness," she added, referring to John G. Roberts Jr., the court's chief justice.

The remarks appeared to edge beyond the position that Ms. Collins staked out in conversations with reporters last week, when she made clear that she saw *Roe v. Wade* as precedent that should not be overturned. She had not said explicitly that the view could sway her vote.

Still, liberals dismissed her position as "flimsy." A longtime target for conservatives, abortion rights and the court's liberal decision in *Roe v. Wade* have emerged as one of the major flash points in the fight over filling the seat left by Justice Anthony M. Kennedy when he retires this summer.

Ms. Collins, among the few remaining voices of centrism in the Republican Party, is one of two Republican senators who have supported abortion rights and, in the past, have shown themselves willing to break with their party. The other is Senator Lisa Murkowski,

Republican of Alaska. Because Republicans have only the narrowest of majorities in the Senate, their votes could sink or elevate whomever President Trump nominates to fill the seat.

Ms. Murkowski, for her part, has said she will consider a nominee's views on the abortion rights case, but that it alone would not be a litmus test for her choice.

Both Ms. Collins and Ms. Murkowski were among a small group of moderate Republicans and Democrats who met with Mr. Trump to discuss the pick at the White House last week. Ms. Collins said on Sunday that she could not support some of the names on a list of 25 highly conservative jurists from which Mr. Trump has said he will choose. She said she urged the president to broaden his list.

"I think the president should not feel bound by that list and instead should seek out recommendations to ensure that he gets the best possible person," she said on ABC.

Mr. Trump told reporters on Friday that he had reduced that list to around five candidates, including two women.

In an interview on Fox News's "Sunday Morning Futures" that was broadcast Sunday morning, Mr. Trump reiterated that he was advised not to ask candidates for the open seat about their position on overturning the abortion rights case.

"They were all saying 'don't do that,'" he said, referencing advice he was given for the interview process.

But the president has said previously that he would seek to appoint judges that would roll back abortion rights. And the candidates included on his broader list were vetted by the conservative Federalist Society, suggesting that all the nominees are, at a minimum, not supportive of abortion rights.

He also hailed Justice Neil M. Gorsuch, his first Supreme Court appointee, who sided with the conservative majority on several major closely decided cases this term.

"Honestly, if the Democrats would have won the election, first of all, you would have had a lot different — if you look at the last four decisions in the Supreme Court at 5-4, they would have all been reversed," he said. "As president — I mean obviously outside of war and peace — the biggest decision you can make is the selection of a Supreme Court justice."

Ms. Collins said she believed that neither Mr. Roberts nor Mr. Gorsuch, whom she voted to confirm to the court last year, would vote to overturn *Roe v. Wade*. Ms. Collins said Mr. Gorsuch, who was an author of a book on judicial precedents, "understands how important a principle that is in our judicial system."

Pressed to account for the court's recent decisions overturning precedent in other cases, Ms. Collins said she viewed the abortion rights case as long-settled law not subject to the same revision.

Liberals leading the charge against Mr. Trump's potential picks quickly dismissed Ms. Collins's remarks, suggesting that the senator was either being hoodwinked or knowingly obfuscating her position. They pointed to court decisions as recently as last week — when the justices overturned a four-decade-old precedent in *Janus v. American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees* to deal a blow to organized labor — in which it reversed earlier rulings.

"This proves how flimsy Collins' pro-Roe position is," Brian Fallon, a longtime Democratic operative whose organization, Demand Justice, is helping organize opposition to potential nominees, wrote on Twitter on Sunday morning, referring to Ms. Collins's comments on Mr. Gorsuch. "She is perfectly happy to let herself be suckered based on phony assurances about 'precedent.'"

Senator Tammy Duckworth, Democrat of Illinois, said Ms. Collins and Ms. Murkowski should be highly skeptical of assurances about precedent, particularly in the confirmation process, when nominees frequently decline to speculate on potential rulings.

"Justice Gorsuch told her that he would respect precedent, and yet he has voted against precedent just this week with the *Janus* case," Ms. Duckworth said on "State of the Union." "If anything, this president, this administration is all about overturning precedents."

Conservative groups and Republican lawmakers have sought to play down individual cases or issues that could prove divisive in the confirmation process, arguing more broadly that Mr. Trump has the right to appoint a conservative justice of his choosing.

Leonard Leo, a conservative lawyer who advised Mr. Trump on his appointment of Mr. Gorsuch, said earlier on Sunday that overturning *Roe v. Wade* was not a significant part of deciding who would fill the vacancy, adding that the case is a "major precedent in America."

"I don't think at the end of the day it's about *Roe v. Wade*," he said on "Fox News Sunday." "It's about having judges on the court who are going to interpret the Constitution the way it's written. And part of interpreting the Constitution is taking into account major precedents, and that's going to happen."

Mr. Trump, who spent part of his weekend at his Bedminster golf resort in New Jersey conferring with Donald F. McGahn II, the White House counsel, about his pick for the vacancy, emphasized that he would pick a judge that would uphold the court's slim 5-to-4 conservative majority.

"I'm going to pick somebody who's outstanding," he said, adding that he told Justice Kennedy, "I'll do it in your honor."

Susan Collins Says She Won't Support Supreme Court Nominee Who Demonstrates 'hostility To *Roe V. Wade*'

By Heather Long

[Washington Post](#), July 1, 2018

Sen. Susan Collins (R-Maine), a key swing vote on President Trump's next Supreme Court pick, said Sunday that she would not vote for any judge who wanted to end access to abortion in the United States by overturning *Roe v. Wade*.

"I would not support a nominee who demonstrated hostility to *Roe v. Wade*," Collins said Sunday on CNN's "State of the Union," adding that *Roe v. Wade* established abortion as a "constitutional right."

In another appearance, on ABC News's "This Week," Collins said that any judge who wants to overturn *Roe* has an "activist agenda" that she thinks goes against the fundamental tenets of U.S. law and the Constitution.

Trump has already met with Collins to discuss potential candidates for the Supreme Court, and she said she let him know that she would not support some of the people on the list of 25 judges he's considering for the critical role on the nation's highest court. She said she urged him to expand his list.

On the 2016 campaign trail, Trump indicated that he would take into account whether a judge would overturn *Roe v. Wade* when he considered them for a Supreme Court position, but he has changed his rhetoric in the past week after Justice Anthony M. Kennedy announced his retirement.

Collins said Trump assured her that he would not ask nominees whether they would vote to overturn *Roe v. Wade*.

"The president told me in our meeting that he would not ask that question," she said on CNN. In her ABC News appearance, Collins added that she feels it would be "inappropriate" for Trump to ask that question.

Supreme Court nominees must be confirmed by a majority in the U.S. Senate. Republicans have 51 votes, so anything more than one defection would sink a nominee unless a Democrat crossed party lines. Collins and Lisa Murkowski (R-Alaska) are widely considered the critical swing voters. Both women bucked Trump by voting against the health-care overhaul bill last summer, and they have tended to support access to abortion.

Sen. Amy Klobuchar (D-Minn.), a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, appeared just after Collins

on "This Week" and called her Republican colleague's remarks in support of Roe v. Wade "very heartening."

Trump has said that he views picking Supreme Court justices as the most important thing he will do as president outside of war and peace. He said at a rally in North Dakota last week that he wants to pick someone who will "be there for 40, 45 years."

Collins: White House Has Expanded Its List Of Potential Supreme Court Picks

By Brett Samuels

[The Hill](#), July 1, 2018

The White House has expanded its list of potential Supreme Court nominees after Sen. Susan Collins (Maine) urged President Trump to broaden his search, the GOP senator said Sunday.

"The White House Counsel told me there have been a few additional, potential nominees added to that list," Collins said during an interview on ABC's "This Week" while discussing her meeting with Trump earlier this week.

Collins said that she suggested Trump broaden his search beyond the list of 25 candidates that the White House released in November.

The White House did not immediately respond to a request for comment on Sunday.

The GOP senator's comments came days after Trump said that he would use the list when picking a nominee to replace retiring Justice Anthony Kennedy.

Collins stressed that Trump "should not feel bound by that list."

GOP Sen. Susan Collins on her discussion with Pres. Trump about his SCOTUS nominee: "I told him that I was looking for a nominee that would demonstrate a respect for precedent...I also suggested that he broaden his search beyond the list of 25 nominees." [#ThisWeek pic.twitter.com/pqw8X4bJ16](#)— ABC News (@ABC) July 1, 2018

The Maine senator, who will serve as a crucial vote in the upcoming confirmation process, noted that she could not vote for some individuals on Trump's list because they don't respect stare decisis, the concept that once a case is decided, it is law.

"Some people on list I can't support because they have shown disrespect for vital principle of stare decisis," Collins said. "I'm not going to go into which ones those are but there are people on that list whom I could not vote for."

Kennedy announced that he is retiring effective July 31. His retirement provides Trump an opportunity to select his replacement, further shaping the court for years to come.

The president said he intends to name a nominee on July 9, and Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell said the Senate will vote on the pick this fall.

Collins Says Supreme Court Pick Who'd Overturn Roe V. Wade 'would Not Be Acceptable'

By Mark Moore

[New York Post](#), July 1, 2018

GOP Sen. Susan Collins, expected to be a crucial vote in confirming a Supreme Court nominee in the Senate, said on Sunday she would be unable to support any candidate that vowed to overturn the landmark decision legalizing abortion.

"A candidate for this important position who would overturn Roe v. Wade would not be acceptable to me because that would indicate an activist agenda that I don't want to see a judge have, and that would indicate to me a failure to respect precedent," Collins said on ABC's "This Week."

The pro-choice Maine lawmaker said her support for a nominee to replace Justice Anthony Kennedy, who announced his retirement last week, will hinge on whether the person follows precedent.

Trump told reporters aboard Air Force One on Friday that he would not ask candidates where they stand on the 1973 abortion ruling.

"[Trump] did tell me that he would not be asking that question," Collins said. "And indeed it would be inappropriate to ask a judge nominee on how they are going to vote in a future case. A discussion of precedent however is very important."

Sen. Lindsey Graham also said Roe v. Wade shouldn't be overturned "unless there is good reason."

"You don't overturn precedent unless there's a good reason," the South Carolina lawmaker said on NBC's "Meet the Press." "I would tell my pro-life friends: you can be pro-life and conservative, but you can also believe in stare decisis," he added, using a legal term referring to precedent.

Kennedy, 81, played an important role in providing a crucial swing vote on a number of important cases and with his retirement many believe the court could become more conservative and overturn past rulings like Roe v. Wade.

He was a member of the court in 1992 that voted to reaffirm the decision.

Collins also suggested Trump expand his search beyond a list of 25 candidates he initially used to find a candidate.

"Some people on list I can't support because they have shown disrespect for vital principle of stare decisis,"

Collins said on ABC. "I'm not going to go into which ones those are but there are people on that list whom I could not vote for."

Trump said he has narrowed down the list to about five, including two women, and said he intends to announce the nominee on July 9 before he heads to Europe for a NATO meeting and a summit with Russian President Vladimir Putin.

Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell said he would call for a vote before the mid-term elections in November.

Republicans, who control the Senate by a 51-49 margin, only need a majority to confirm Trump's court pick.

This would be the president's second court pick.

He selected Justice Neil Gorsuch in January 2017 to replace Antonin Scalia, who died in February 2016.

Collins Says She Can't Back Judge Who Would Strike Roe V. Wade

By Mark Niquette, Christopher Condon

[Bloomberg News](#), July 1, 2018

President Donald Trump shouldn't pick someone for the Supreme Court who doesn't respect legal precedent, including the "settled" 1973 decision that legalized abortion, Republican Senator Susan Collins of Maine said.

"A candidate for this important position who would overturn Roe v. Wade would not be acceptable to me, because that would indicate an activist agenda that I don't want to see a judge have," Collins said Sunday in an interview on ABC's "This Week."

Collins said she urged Trump during a meeting last week to broaden the list of 25 possible justices he released during the campaign, and that the White House subsequently told her five more people had been added to it.

"I got the feeling that he was still deliberating and had not yet reached a decision, and that this was genuine outreach on his part," Collins said. "There are people on that list whom I could not support."

Collins is among small group of U.S. senators whose support is seen as crucial to securing the confirmation of a new Supreme Court Justice following the retirement announcement of Justice Anthony Kennedy.

The Maine senator has said previously that she wouldn't support someone who pledges to overturn Roe v. Wade, the Supreme Court ruling that legalized abortion in the U.S. It's settled law, and justices must respect legal precedent, she said. Graham's View

Republican Senator Lindsey Graham of South Carolina said on NBC's "Meet the Press" on Sunday that he wouldn't vote for a nominee who promises to overturn a case before the facts are presented. Graham said he also supports the concept of stare decisis, meaning a respect for legal precedent.

"That means you don't overturn precedent unless there's a good reason," Graham said. "And I would tell my pro-life friends you can be pro-life and conservative, but you can also believe in stare decisis."

Leonard Leo, a former vice president of the Federalist Society who has advised Trump on judicial nominations, also expressed support for the idea of a justice upholding precedent in an interview on "Fox News Sunday."

"I don't think at the end of the day it's about Roe v. Wade," Leo said. "It's about having judges on the court who are going to interpret the constitution the way it's written, and part of interpreting the constitution is taking into account major precedents, and that's going to happen." Not That Specific

Trump said on Fox News's "Sunday Morning Futures" that he "probably" wouldn't ask his potential nominees about how they would vote on the abortion law. He said he's been told he shouldn't be that specific in his questions, though he will be putting a conservative on the court.

Senator Richard Durbin, Democrat of Illinois, said he thinks Trump is looking for a justice who will overturn the abortion law, as well as rule that protections under President Barack Obama's health-care overhaul against denying insurance to those with pre-existing conditions are unconstitutional.

"Donald Trump is looking for a justice who's going to rule in his favor," Durbin said on "Fox News Sunday." Meeting with Senators

White House Press Secretary Sarah Huckabee Sanders said in a tweet Thursday that Trump had met with Collins and fellow Republicans Chuck Grassley of Iowa, chairman of the Senate's Judiciary Committee, and Lisa Murkowski of Alaska, as well as Democrats Heidi Heitkamp of North Dakota, Joe Donnelly of Indiana and Joe Manchin of West Virginia.

Manchin, Donnelly and Heitkamp are Democrats from states Trump won in 2016. He has targeted them for defeat in November's midterm elections. That makes them more likely than other senators in their party to support his nominee for the court.

With Republicans controlling the Senate 51 to 49, Democrats must prevent any defections and win over at least one Republican if they hope to block a nominee.

Trump said Friday he had narrowed his search to about five finalists, including two women, and will

announce his pick on July 9. Trump said that he may interview one or two candidates this weekend at his resort in Bedminster, New Jersey.

A person familiar with the process said White House officials are focused primarily on five federal appeals court judges – Brett Kavanaugh, Amy Coney Barrett, Thomas Hardiman, Raymond Kethledge and Amul Thapar.

— With assistance by Margaret Talev

Collins Would Oppose Court Pick With Roe V Wade 'Hostility'

By Hope Yen And Ken Thomas

[Associated Press](#), July 1, 2018

Republican Sen. Susan Collins, a key vote on President Donald Trump's pick for the Supreme Court, said Sunday she would oppose any nominee she believed would overturn the landmark Roe v. Wade decision that legalized abortion.

The White House is focusing on five to seven potential candidates to fill the vacancy of retiring Justice Anthony Kennedy, a swing vote on the court. The Maine senator said she would only back a judge who would show respect for settled law such as the 45-year-old Roe decision, which has long been an anathema to conservatives.

"I would not support a nominee who demonstrated hostility to Roe v. Wade because that would mean to me that their judicial philosophy did not include a respect for established decisions, established law," Collins said.

Such a judge, she said, "would not be acceptable to me because that would indicate an activist agenda."

Trump spent the weekend at his New Jersey golf club conferring with his advisers, including White House counsel Don McGahn, as he considers his options to fill the vacancy that might make precedent-shattering court decisions on abortion, health care, gay marriage and other issues.

The president told reporters Friday that he was homing in on up to seven candidates, including two women, and would announce his choice on July 9.

Trump is expected to begin his search in earnest this week at the White House and said the process could include interviews at his golf club before he reaches a final decision following the Fourth of July holiday.

During his 2016 campaign and presidency, Trump embraced anti-abortion groups and vowed to appoint federal judges who will favor efforts to roll back abortion rights. But he told reporters on Friday that he would not question potential high-court nominees about their views on abortion, saying it was "inappropriate to discuss."

The Supreme Court legalized abortion in 1973, but anti-abortion advocates hope Roe v. Wade will soon be overruled if Trump gets the chance to appoint a justice who could cast a potentially decisive vote against it.

Without Kennedy, the high court will have four justices picked by Democratic presidents and four picked by Republicans, giving Trump the chance to shift the ideological balance toward conservatives for years to come. Both Chief Justice John Roberts and Justice Neil Gorsuch, Trump's first pick to the high court, have indicated more broadly that they respect legal precedent.

On Sunday, Leonard Leo, an outside adviser to Trump on judicial nominations, said he expected Trump to select a nominee who is mindful of precedent but who is also more "originalist and textualist." That judicial approach typically involves a more literal interpretation of the Constitution as compared to broader rulings such as Roe.

Possible nominees being eyed include Thomas Hardiman, who serves alongside Trump's sister on the Philadelphia-based 3rd U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals, and Raymond Kethledge, a federal appeals court judge who clerked for Kennedy. Also of interest are Amul Thapar, who serves on the federal appeals court in Cincinnati; Brett Kavanaugh, a former clerk for Kennedy who serves on the federal appeals court in Washington, D.C.; and Amy Coney Barrett, who serves on the federal appeals court in Chicago.

Echoing Leo's view, Sen. Lindsey Graham, R-S.C., a member of the Judiciary Committee, said he didn't think Trump would be overly focused on the Roe ruling.

"You don't overturn precedent unless there's a good reason," Graham said. "I would tell my pro-life friends: You can be pro-life and conservative, but you can also believe in 'stare decisis,'" he said, citing the legal term involving legal precedent that means "to stand by things decided."

Republicans hold a narrow 51-49 majority in the Senate, and it's even closer because of the absence of ailing Sen. John McCain of Arizona. Even though McConnell changed Senate rules last year to allow confirmation by simple majority, if Democrats hold together, he cannot afford defections. Vice President Mike Pence can be called on to break a tie.

Collins appeared on ABC's "This Week" and CNN's "State of the Union," Leo spoke on "Fox News Sunday" and Graham was on NBC's "Meet the Press."

Copyright 2018 Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten, or redistributed.

GOP Sen. Susan Collins Won't Support Supreme Court Nominee Hostile To Roe V. Wade

By Valerie Richardson

[Washington Times](#), July 1, 2018

Sen. Susan Collins, Maine Republican, said Sunday that she would refuse to support a Supreme Court nominee bent on overturning the landmark 1973 Roe v. Wade decision, saying such a position would violate respect for judicial precedent.

"I would not support a nominee who demonstrated hostility to Roe v. Wade because that would mean to me that their judicial philosophy did not include a respect for established decisions, established law," Ms. Collins said on CNN's "State of the Union."

During a meeting Thursday, she said President Trump told her he would not ask potential nominees whether they would overturn the Roe decision legalizing abortion, despite his comments to the contrary on the 2016 campaign trail.

"The president told me in our meeting that he would not ask that question, and that is what he has most recently said on the advice of his attorney," Ms. Collins said. "So I think what he said as a candidate may not have been informed by the legal advice that he now has, that it would be inappropriate to ask a nominee how he or she would rule on a specific issue."

On #CNNSOTU with @jaketapper@SenatorCollins says that she would not vote for a SCOTUS nominee who "demonstrates hostility" to Roe v. Wade <https://t.co/lqmv3x91w8> — State of the Union (@CNNSotu) July 1, 2018

A moderate Republican, Ms. Collins is seen as critical in approving President Trump's nominee to fill the seat of Justice Anthony Kennedy, who announced his retirement last week.

Mr. Trump has said he will announce his selection July 9.

Ms. Collins described the Roe decision as "a ruling that has been settled law for 45 years, and it involves a constitutional right and has been reaffirmed by the court 26 years ago."

Dick Durbin Accuses Trump Of Seeking Supreme Court Nominee Who'll Overturn Roe V. Wade, Obamacare

By Valerie Richardson

[Washington Times](#), July 1, 2018

Senate Minority Whip Dick Durbin on Sunday accused President Trump of seeking a Supreme Court pick who will overturn Roe v. Wade and Obamacare in

what has become a rallying cry for Democrats trying to defeat the still-unnamed nominee.

"The president is looking for someone who will overturn Roe versus Wade," said Mr. Durbin, referring to the 1973 Supreme Court decision legalizing abortion nationwide, on "Fox News Sunday."

"But even equally important, he's looking for someone on the court who will make sure that they rule that the Affordable Care Act's protection of those with preexisting conditions is unconstitutional," Mr. Durbin continued.

@SenatorDurbin on #SCOTUSnominee: "The President is looking for someone who will overturn Roe v. Wade." pic.twitter.com/rDEk0miTd5 — FoxNewsSunday (@FoxNewsSunday) July 1, 2018

Disputing Mr. Durbin's contention was Leonard Leo, executive vice president of the Federalist Society and a key White House advisor on judicial nominations.

"None of the people who are being talked about now in the public space in the media are people who have a clear position on Roe v. Wade," Mr. Leo said. "The most important thing here is a record showing fairness, someone who listens very carefully to arguments on both sides, someone who tries to keep an open mind."

Mr. Trump has said he will name on July 9 his selection to fill the vacancy being left by Justice Anthony Kennedy, who announced his pending retirement last week.

Mr. Leo pointed out that Democrats inevitably accuse the GOP's high-court nominees of seeking to overturn Roe—the same thing was said about Mr. Kennedy as well as former Justices Sandra Day O'Connor and David Souter—and yet it's never happened.

"No president is particularly good at speculating about these things, and nobody is," Mr. Leo said.

He said the only justice who has made it clear that he would "explicitly overturn Roe" was Justice Clarence Thomas, who was nominated by President George H.W. Bush in 1991.

"I don't think at the end of the day, it's about Roe v. Wade," Mr. Leo said. "It's about having judges on the court who are going to interpret the Constitution the way it's written, and part of interpreting the Constitution is taking into account major precedents, and that's going to happen."

Leonard Leo: "At the end of the day it's about Roe v. Wade, it's about having judges on the court who are going to interpret the constitution the way it's written and part of interpreting the constitution is taking into account major precedents and that's going to happen."

#FNSpic.twitter.com/1vUKePNZck — FoxNewsSunday (@FoxNewsSunday) July 1, 2018

Mr. Durbin said that while Americans are divided on abortion, they're united on health coverage for those with preexisting conditions.

"When it comes to basic health care for American families, protecting those who have preexisting conditions, this administration is attacking that on constitutional grounds and at this moment Donald Trump is looking for a justice who's going to rule in his favor," Mr. Durbin said.

Wrong Vote On Trump Supreme Court Pick Could Be 'Career-ending Move,' Sen. Maria Cantwell Warns

By Valerie Richardson

[Washington Times](#), July 1, 2018

Sen. Maria Cantwell, Washington Democrat, warned her colleagues Sunday that a wrong decision on President Trump's Supreme Court nominee could become a "career-ending move."

"I think that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle know that this vote could be one of the key votes of their entire career," Ms. Cantwell said on NBC's "Meet the Press." "And they know that no matter what spin comes out of the White House, if they vote for somebody who's going to change precedent, it could be a career-ending move."

For pro-choice lawmakers, the phrase "change precedent" has become code for overturning the 1973 *Roe v. Wade* decision, which legalized abortion nationwide.

Mr. Trump has said he will announce his pick on July 9 to replace retiring Justice Anthony Kennedy, a Reagan appointee who often acted as the court's swing vote.

His role on the court has raised the stakes is expected to result in a more pitched battle than that surrounding than Mr. Trump's first selection, Neil Gorsuch, who filled the vacancy left by the death of Justice Antonin Scalia, a conservative.

"This is a very different Supreme Court discussion because everyone in the United States Senate who's going to vote on this knows that it will change the balance of power," said Ms. Cantwell. "So you're not just voting on whether you think Trump should have his nominee, you're voting on whether that nominee is going to change precedent when it comes to a whole host of issues."

Mr. Trump met Thursday with five Senate Democratic and Republican moderates expected to cast

crucial votes on the nomination, including GOP Sens. Susan Collins and Lisa Murkowski.

"We're a 51-49 senate, and if he wants to throw an extreme conservative who basically says I'm not going to follow precedent, I'm not going to follow these laws, then yes, that to me is a major change," said Ms. Cantwell.

If Mr. Trump does nominate an "extreme conservative," she said the plan is to emphasize how the nominee would change the court's ideological balance.

"The plan here is to speak out about the change in balance in the court," said Ms. Cantwell. "You are not just voting as was with Gorsuch for just one more name. You know that Justice Kennedy was a swing vote, that he was a libertarian."

Dem Senator Says Supreme Court Vote Could Be 'Career Ending' For Lawmakers

By Emily Birnbaum

[The Hill](#), July 1, 2018

Sen. Maria Cantwell (D-Wash.) on Sunday said her colleagues' votes on President Trump's Supreme Court nominee could be a "career-ending move."

"I think that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle know that this vote could be one of the key votes of their entire career," Cantwell said on NBC's "Meet the Press." "And they know that no matter what spin comes out of the White House, if they vote for somebody who's going to change precedent, it could be a career-ending move."

Cantwell's speculation comes days after Supreme Court Justice Anthony Kennedy announced his retirement from the bench at the end of next month. His retirement opens up an opportunity for Trump to nominate his second justice to the bench, potentially redefining the nation's highest court for generations to come.

"We're a 51-49 Senate and if [Trump] wants to throw an extreme conservative who basically says, 'I'm not going to follow precedent, I'm not going to follow these laws,' then yes, that to me is a major change," Cantwell said.

Cantwell expressed concern that Trump's nominee would overturn the precedent set by *Roe v. Wade*, the landmark Supreme Court case that paved the way for legalized abortion nationwide.

"You're not just voting on if you think Trump should have his nominee," Cantwell said. "You're voting on whether that nominee is going to change precedent when it comes to a whole host of issues — a woman's right to choose, your access to healthcare."

Sen. Susan Collins (R-Maine), who will be a key vote in confirming Trump's nominee, also said she would

not greenlight a nominee who came out against *Roe v. Wade*.

"A candidate for this important position who would overturn *Roe v. Wade* would not be acceptable to me because that would indicate an activist agenda that I don't want to see a judge have, and that would indicate to me a failure to respect precedent," Collins said Sunday on ABC's "This Week."

Supreme Court Nomination Will Put Red-state Democrats In Even Bigger Campaign Quandary

By Seth McLaughlin

[Washington Times](#), July 1, 2018

Red-state Democrats seeking re-election this fall were already facing the difficult task of navigating between their own virulently anti-Trump national party and the Republican-leaning voters needed to win back home. But that narrow path has become even more of a tightrope now that incumbents will be asked to take sides on the president's impending Supreme Court nomination.

Mr. Trump said he will move quickly to name a replacement for retiring Justice Anthony M. Kennedy, and Senate Republican leaders said they will vote on his pick this fall, brushing aside Democrats' demands to wait until after the election.

If the Republicans hold firm, the Senate is likely to vote on a Supreme Court nominee just as the midterm campaign season hits full stride, after Labor Day.

It also means vulnerable Democrats in states such as West Virginia and North Dakota will have to choose between a president who easily won their states in 2016 and a frenzied liberal base intent on blocking anyone he chooses.

"This will become the defining issue in all of the contested Senate races," said Chris Pack, spokesman for the Senate Leadership Fund. "It is a litmus-test vote for all red-state Democrats on whether they have President Trump's back or not. Nothing else comes close."

In the spotlight immediately are Sens. Joe Manchin III of West Virginia, Joe Donnelly of Indiana and Heidi Heitkamp of North Dakota — the three Democrats who broke with their party last year to vote for Mr. Trump's first Supreme Court nominee, Justice Neil M. Gorsuch.

The three lawmakers met separately with Mr. Trump last week at The White House.

Others include Sens. Jon Tester of Montana and Claire McCaskill of Missouri, whose states Mr. Trump also easily won in 2016.

Mr. Trump is slated to hold a rally in Montana on Thursday.

Mr. Donnelly last week downplayed the idea that he is on the hot seat.

"I don't worry about pressure," he said.

Mr. Manchin released a statement saying he will give the nominee a fair shake but didn't stop to answer questions from reporters late last week.

Mr. Manchin told a West Virginia radio station that he advised Mr. Trump during their meeting to nominate a centrist and cautioned against a nominee who would overturn *Roe v. Wade*.

"All that stuff is red flags for all Americans," Mr. Manchin said. "*Roe v. Wade* has been the law for 40-something years."

Ms. Heitkamp, meanwhile, kept a brisk pace as reporters chased her, signaling only that she would vet Mr. Trump's choice.

One night earlier, Mr. Trump made sure that North Dakota voters were focused on the issue during a campaign stop with Rep. Kevin Cramer, Ms. Heitkamp's Republican opponent.

"Heidi will vote 'no' to any pick we make for the Supreme Court. She will be told to do so," Mr. Trump predicted. "Democrats want judges who will rewrite the Constitution any way they want to do it and take away your Second Amendment, erase your borders, throw open the jailhouse doors and destroy your freedoms."

Just hours after Justice Kennedy's retirement announcement, the Judicial Crisis Network, a conservative pressure group, said it was buying airtime for ads on television and digital platforms targeting vulnerable Democrats.

One Nation, the issue advocacy arm of the Republican-associated Senate Leadership Fund, announced Thursday that it would be running online ads targeting Democrats on the pending Supreme Court vote in 10 states.

The first "SCOTUS" spot targeted Sen. Tammy Baldwin of Wisconsin, a state Mr. Trump narrowly won. The ad warns that the nation's "freedom hangs in the balance" and that the "far left will stop at nothing to block President Trump's choice."

Republicans said the irony was that vulnerable Democrats would bolster their re-election chances if they sided with Mr. Trump.

Mike Braun, the Republican candidate in Indiana's Senate race, predicted that Mr. Donnelly would end up voting for Mr. Trump's pick in an attempt to pander to voters.

"Given that it's an election year, I expect Sen. Donnelly to vote for President Trump's nominee to distract from his liberal record of opposing tax reform,

passing Obamacare and supporting Obama's nuclear deal with Iran," Mr. Braun said.

With a slim 51-seat Senate majority, Republicans have the votes to confirm Mr. Trump's pick unless some Republican lawmakers get cold feet or look to send the president a message.

On Sunday, Sen. Susan M. Collins, Maine Republican, warned that she would refuse to support a Supreme Court nominee bent on overturning the landmark 1973 Roe v. Wade decision, saying such a position would violate respect for judicial precedent.

Democratic leaders are already making a play to persuade other centrist Republicans to break with Mr. Trump, and liberal activist groups have vowed to punish Democrats who side with Mr. Trump.

"We're organizing Senate Democrats to FIGHT," the Progressive Change Campaign Committee said in an email blast. "That starts with all of us showing them that their legacies will be forever based on their strength or weakness in this moment."

Jim Dean, chair of Democracy for America, said voters are demanding that "Senate Democrats to do everything in their power to reject whatever anti-choice, pro-corporate, enabler of bigotry and hate Donald Trump and Mitch McConnell attempt to force onto the U.S. Supreme Court to replace Justice Kennedy."

Trump Delaying NAFTA Deal Until After Midterm Elections

By Ken Thomas

[Associated Press](#), July 1, 2018

President Donald Trump intends to delay signing a revised version of the North American Free Trade Agreement until after the fall midterm elections, a move aimed at reaching a better deal with Canada and Mexico.

Trump said in an interview that aired Sunday that he could quickly sign an agreement with the United States' neighbors, "but I'm not happy with it. I want to make it more fair." Asked about the timing of an agreement, Trump said: "I want to wait until after the election."

The president's decision to push back the NAFTA talks comes as the U.S. and Canada have been engaged in a tit-for-tat trade dispute over Trump's tariffs on Canadian steel and aluminum. Canada announced billions of dollars in retaliatory tariffs against the U.S. on Friday, and the president signaled the trade rattling could continue.

In the interview on Fox News Channel's "Sunday Morning Futures with Maria Bartiromo," Trump again threatened to impose tariffs on imported cars, trucks and

auto parts, saying, "The cars are the big ones." The move has been viewed as a possible negotiating ploy to restart NAFTA talks, which could resume following Sunday's elections in Mexico.

If the U.S. moved forward with tariffs on auto imports, it would be a blow to Canada's economy because of the critical nature that the auto industry plays in the country. The U.S. Commerce Department is expected to hold hearings on auto tariffs in late July and to complete its investigation into auto imports later this summer.

Trump has sought to renegotiate NAFTA to encourage manufacturers to invest more in America and shift production from low-wage Mexico to the United States. The talks have stalled over several issues, including Trump's insistence on a clause that would end NAFTA every five years unless all three countries agree to sustain it.

The president has suggested he may pursue separate trade pacts with Canada and Mexico instead of continuing with a three-country deal. But any reworked deal would need to be considered by Congress, and negotiators missed a self-imposed deadline to wrap up the talks by mid-May to allow it to be considered by lawmakers before the November elections.

Trump has clashed with Canadian Prime Minister Justin Trudeau over trade, with the U.S. president tweeting last month after departing the G-7 meetings in Quebec that Trudeau was "weak" and "dishonest."

Trump and Trudeau spoke by phone late Friday after Canada announced it would impose its own tariffs in retaliation for the U.S. tariffs on steel and aluminum imports. Trudeau's office said the prime minister "conveyed that Canada has had no choice but to announce reciprocal countermeasures" to the U.S. tariffs.

Copyright 2018 Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten, or redistributed.

Trump Cites Car-Tariff Threat As Biggest Trade Leverage

Fox interview comments suggest recent steel tariffs were a dry run for bigger fight on autos

By Jacob M. Schlesinger

[Wall Street Journal](#), July 1, 2018

Full-text stories from the Wall Street Journal are available to Journal subscribers by clicking the link.

EU Warns Washington Of 'Harmful' Impact On US Of Car Tariffs

By Matthew Karnitschnig

[Politico Europe](#), July 1, 2018

The European Commission has warned the United States that imposing tariffs on European cars “will be harmful first and foremost for the US economy.”

The Commission's warning was part of a response — seen by POLITICO Brussels Playbook — to a U.S. request for comment on the issue. The response was dated last Friday and sent to the U.S. Commerce Department's Bureau of Industry and Security.

The 11-page document states that the EU's internal analysis “shows that an additional import tariff of 25 percent, applied to automobiles and automotive parts, would in first instance have a negative impact on US GDP in the order of 13-14 billion USD, and the current account balance of the US would be not affected positively.”

U.S. President Donald Trump recently threatened to hit imports of European cars with a 20 percent tariff if Brussels doesn't remove tariffs and other trade barriers in an escalating row.

European carmakers produced 2.9 million vehicles, or 26 percent of American car production, in the U.S. last year, according to the document. Even without Chrysler — which is, as the Commission notes, “one of the traditional US ‘big three’ manufacturers” but is now of “European ownership” — production by EU-owned companies in the U.S. “still amounts to 16 percent of national production and 1.8 million vehicles.”

The document also reminds Washington that European companies that produce in the U.S. often import needed parts for their American factories, and also export large portions of their final product: “EU companies based in the US export a significant part of their production, thus contributing substantially to improving the US trade balance, which is a priority of the administration,” the paper states.

“Around 60 percent of automobiles produced in the US by companies with exclusive EU ownership are exported to third countries, including the EU. Measures harming these companies would be self-defeating and would weaken the US economy,” the document adds, arguing that cars would become more expensive and harder to sell.

Plus, the Commission says imposing tariffs on European cars could elicit “countermeasures” from the U.S.'s other trading partners: “The impact will be aggravated significantly by the likely countermeasures of US trading partners over a significant volume of trade,” the Commission warns.

Canada Tariffs On US Goods From Ketchup To Lawn Mowers Begin

By Paul Wiseman And Tracey Lindeman

[Associated Press](#), July 1, 2018

Canada began imposing tariffs Sunday on \$12.6 billion in U.S. goods as retaliation for the Trump administration's new taxes on steel and aluminum imported to the United States.

Some U.S. products, mostly steel and iron, face 25 percent tariffs, the same penalty the United States slapped on imported steel at the end of May. Other U.S. imports, from ketchup to pizza to dishwasher detergent, will face a 10 percent tariff at the Canadian border, the same as America's tax on imported aluminum.

Trump had enraged Canada and other U.S. allies by declaring imported steel and aluminum a threat to America's national security and therefore a legitimate target for U.S. tariffs. Canada is the United States' second-biggest trading partner in goods, just behind China.

Speaking Sunday in Leamington, Ontario, Prime Minister Justin Trudeau thanked Canadians for standing united against President Donald Trump's sanctions. He urged Canadians to “make their choices accordingly” in considering whether to buy American products.

The selection of Leamington, known as Canada's tomato capital, was no accident. The town is home to a food-processing plant that supplies tomato paste and other products to French's, a major competitor of Kraft Heinz. Heinz left Canada and sold its Leamington plant in 2014, after 105 years of Canadian operations.

The new Canadian tariffs, which took effect at 12:01 a.m. Sunday, are hitting a long list of U.S. consumer goods, including ketchup and other Kraft Heinz products.

As part of his combative America First approach, Trump has repeatedly attacked the trade policies of the United States' northern neighbor, citing Canada's triple-digit tariffs on dairy products, which account for only about 0.1 percent of U.S.-Canada trade. The United States, in fact, last year enjoyed a \$2.8 billion overall trade surplus with Canada.

Trump has also tried to pressure Canada and Mexico into agreeing to rewrite the 24-year-old North American Free Trade Agreement to shift more auto production and investment to the United States. But that effort has stalled, and Trump said Sunday that he didn't expect a deal that he could support until after the U.S. midterm elections in November.

Copyright 2018 Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten, or redistributed.

Trump Stands Firm On Trade, Even As Foreign Tariffs Begin Kicking In

By Heather Long

[Washington Post](#), July 1, 2018

President Trump defiantly stood by his tariffs on Sunday as Canada hit back hard, Mexico was poised to elect a new leader eager to confront him, and the European Union issued a scathing condemnation of his policy as “in effect, a tax on the American people.”

Instead of backing down, Trump brushed off the mounting pressure from businesses and world leaders to scale back the taxes before they cause additional job losses and slower economic growth.

This week will be a critical test of Trump's resolve as Canada on Sunday imposed tariffs on \$12.6 billion of U.S. products and China is set to levy high tariffs on \$34 billion worth of American goods, including soybeans, on Friday, the same day that Trump plans to tax an additional \$34 billion worth of Chinese items.

The additional taxes make it harder for U.S. companies and farmers to sell some items abroad, and they raise costs on many products used in U.S. manufacturing. But Trump shrugged off fears that the tariffs will hurt the economy.

“Every country is calling every day, saying, ‘Let's make a deal, let's make a deal. It's going to all work out,’” Trump said Sunday, echoing his remarks earlier in the year that trade wars are “easy to win.”

Despite Trump's rhetoric, concerns are growing that Trump's appetite for tariffs only appears to be expanding as trade tensions escalate. Many who argued that Trump was just threatening tariffs as a negotiating tactic and would never let the skirmish intensify are now saying they may have miscalculated.

Trump said in an interview on Fox's “Sunday Morning Futures” that the European Union is just as bad as China on trade and that he didn't intend to sign a new North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) deal until after the midterm elections in November.

“The European Union is possibly as bad as China, just smaller,” Trump said Sunday, pointing to the “car situation.”

The E.U. sent Trump's Commerce Department an 11-page document on Friday threatening that the global community would put tariffs on up to \$290 billion of U.S. products if Trump moves forward with tariffs on foreign autos, according to a copy obtained by The Washington Post.

“Protective measures would undermine U.S. growth, negatively impact job creation, and not improve the trade balance,” E.U. leaders wrote, adding that auto

tariffs would “damage further the reputation of the United States.”

Trump is now engaged in trade fights with most of the world's major economies, including China, the European Union and Japan. Although Trump speaks periodically with leaders from these nations, formal trade talks have stalled with most of them as the two sides remain far apart and foreign countries say Trump's wishes are unclear.

“NAFTA, I could sign it tomorrow, but I'm not happy with it. I want to make it more fair, okay?” Trump said, adding that “I want to wait until after the election” to sign it.

A newly elected Mexican president could decrease prospects for signing a revised NAFTA by the end of the year. Many foreign leaders, including Canadian Prime Minister Justin Trudeau, are getting overwhelming support at home for standing up to Trump, making quick deals even less likely.

“This is a really dangerous path we're doing down,” said Chad Bown, a senior fellow at the Peterson Institute for International Economics. “Warning Trump doesn't seem to be enough. It may actually take the costs of these things to show up before he can be convinced of it.”

Iconic American brands such as Harley-Davidson, General Motors and Polaris have warned in recent days that they intend to move production overseas and potentially lay off workers if Trump doesn't end the tariffs. Harley has already made the decision to shift some production abroad, which led to multiple angry tweets from the president.

The pressure on Trump is increasing as the negative effects many have warned him about are starting to be realized. The largest nail manufacturer in the United States, Mid-Continent Nail, has already laid off 60 workers and said it might be out of business by Labor Day.

“I am worried about the trade rhetoric going too far,” tweeted Anthony Scaramucci, a close ally of the president's who worked in the White House briefly last summer, on Saturday. “Change tactics now.”

But Trump has shown few signs of pulling back, saying last week that the tariffs have been “incredible” and are “doing great.” Instead, he is calling for additional tariffs on China and on imported cars, a move that would hurt Europe, Japan and South Korea.

Trump has fairly widespread support for pushing China on trade concessions. But his tariffs on steel and aluminum from U.S. allies and potentially on autos are backed mainly by parts of the manufacturing sector that think they have been put at a disadvantage for years. Supporters of the tariffs argue that any short-term pain

will be worth it in the end and that the impact so far is small.

"I view this as a step in the process to get better agreements," said Scott Paul, president of the Alliance for American Manufacturing. "We have an economy doing well, very low unemployment, manufacturing indicators that continue to be quite positive. The size and scope of tariffs is quite limited when you consider we have a \$19 trillion economy."

At the moment, the United States has imposed tariffs on about \$42 billion worth of imports, and foreign nations have retaliated at about the same level. Those figures will jump significantly as Trump and China impose more tariffs on each other, and it would escalate by hundreds of billions if Trump goes forward with import taxes on cars.

General Motors warned Friday that Trump's tariffs and the retaliation from other nations would force GM to cut jobs and put it at a disadvantage against foreign competitors. But Trump argued that the only consequence would be that more cars would be built in the United States.

"What's going to really happen is there's going to be no tax. You know why? They're going to build their cars in America. They're going to make them here," Trump said.

Some experts now think the only way Trump will change his approach is if there's a major drop in the stock market or economy.

"It will probably take a significant pullback in the stock market to get Trump to back down," said Scott Lincicome, a trade lawyer and adjunct scholar at the Cato Institute, a libertarian think tank. "The Dow and S&P 500 have leveled off, but they are still pretty high since the election, something Trump is proud of."

Trump Says He Won't Sign Any NAFTA Deal Until After Midterms

By Heather Long

[Washington Post](#), July 1, 2018

President Trump said Sunday he is "not happy" with the revised NAFTA deal that his administration has been hammering out with Canada and Mexico and he doesn't want to sign any new agreement until after the midterm elections in November.

The remarks aired on Fox News' "Sunday Morning Futures" on a critical day for the U.S. relationship with its neighbors. Canada started collecting tariffs on \$12.6 billion worth of U.S. products to hit back at Trump, and Mexican voters went to the polls to pick a new president, who will play a key role in shaping any final NAFTA deal.

Front-runner Andrés Manuel López Obrador is known for his populist policies.

"NAFTA, I could sign it tomorrow, but I'm not happy with it. I want to make it more fair, okay?" Trump told Maria Bartiromo of Fox News, adding that "I want to wait until after the election" to sign it.

Trump angered Canada and Mexico by imposing hefty tariffs on steel and aluminum imports from the two countries, citing national security concerns. Those tariffs went into effect on June 1.

Canada Prime Minister Justin Trudeau has called the tariffs "insulting and unacceptable," and he retaliated by putting tariffs on U.S. steel and aluminum as well as products like ketchup and beef on July 1.

Many business and world leaders are hoping for a swift end to Trump's tariffs, which they argue hurt economic growth and U.S. relationships around the world. Trump is now waging trade battles with Canada, Mexico, Europe, Japan and China.

"I am worried about the trade rhetoric going too far. Signs are there: capital is starting to withdraw from stocks. The markets are signaling a lot more risk ... Change tactics now," Anthony Scaramucci, who served in the White House last year and has typically defended the president, tweeted Saturday.

But Trump has shown few signs of pulling back. Instead, he is calling for additional tariffs on China and on imported cars, a move that would hurt Europe, Japan and South Korea.

"The European Union is possibly as bad as China, just smaller," he said Sunday. When he was asked about whether he would back down on tariffs on China, he replied, "No, no, no, no."

The next steps in the escalating trade war are fast approaching. China plans to hit the United States with tariffs on more than 500 goods on Friday, the same day that Trump will start collecting tariffs on \$34 billion in Chinese imports.

General Motors warned Friday that Trump's tariffs and the retaliation from other nations will hurt the company, forcing GM to cut jobs and putting it at a disadvantage against foreign competitors.

But Trump fired back at GM on Sunday, saying the only consequence would be that more cars will be built in the United States.

"What's going to really happen is there's going to be no tax. You know why? They're going to build their cars in America. They're going to make them here," he said.

The president said last week that the tariffs have been "incredible," even though America's largest nail factory in Missouri has begun laying off workers because of the import duties and the iconic American company

Harley-Davidson said it is shifting some production overseas because of the fallout from Trump's trade dispute with the European Union.

Trump predicted his supporters, many of whom are fans of Harley-Davidson, would shun the brand if the company goes forward with moving more production overseas.

"I think they are going to take a big hit," he said. "The people that are buying Harley-Davidson, they don't want it built in another country."

EU Warns Of \$300bn Hit To US Over Car Import Tariffs

By Jim Brunsten In Brussels

[Financial Times](#), July 1, 2018

Full-text stories from the Financial Times are available to FT subscribers by clicking the link.

Trump Says Harley-Davidson Will Take A 'big Hit'

By Nikki Schwab

[New York Post](#), July 1, 2018

President Trump, in an interview aired Sunday, accused American motorcycle maker Harley-Davidson of using tariffs as an excuse to produce more bikes overseas.

"Look, I devoted a lot of time to Harley-Davidson. I treated them good. I guarantee you everybody that ever bought a Harley-Davidson voted for Trump," Trump told Maria Bartiromo during a sit-down for her Fox News show "Sunday Morning Futures."

"I guarantee you everybody that ever bought a Harley Davidson voted for Trump," the president claimed. "I don't know if you know that. I would have to – they call them Bikers for Trump. There's hundreds."

The Wisconsin-based company announced Monday that it would move some of its production overseas to avoid retaliatory tariffs enacted by the European Union in response to Trump's trade policies.

The president also claimed Harley-Davidson had planned to make the move for the past six months.

"They made this deal at the beginning of the year, long before they ever heard of the word tariff," Trump said. "They made this deal at the beginning of the year. And I don't think they should do it."

"Increasing international production to alleviate the EU tariff burden is not the company's preference, but represents the only sustainable option to make its motorcycles accessible to customers in the EU and maintain a viable business in Europe," the company said last week.

"I think that Harley is an American bike. It's an American motorcycle and they should build them in this country," Trump told Bartiromo, repeating comments he made earlier in the week. "They shouldn't play cute."

Trump suggested the company would take a "big hit" for not building its bikes in the United States.

The company recently finished construction of a plant in Thailand.

"I know those people. Those are my voters," he said of Harley enthusiasts. "They don't want Harley-Davidson getting cute to make \$2 more."

Trump: Harley-Davidson Will Take 'big Hit'

By Brent D. Griffiths

[Politico](#), July 1, 2018

President Donald Trump on Sunday warned motorcycle manufacturer Harley-Davidson that he knows its customers and that they will not look kindly on an American company moving some production overseas.

"Everybody who ever bought a Harley-Davidson voted for Trump ... and they are very unhappy about it," the president told Fox Business and Fox News anchor Maria Bartiromo in an interview that aired on "Sunday Morning Futures." "I feel that maybe Harley, I think they are going to take a big hit."

The Wisconsin-based Harley-Davidson said this past week that it was moving some of its production overseas to avoid tariffs on bikes sold in the European Union. Trump's decision to levy tariffs on steel and aluminum from the European Union and other countries triggered the move.

"The tremendous cost increase, if passed onto its dealers and retail customers, would have an immediate and lasting detrimental impact to its business in the region," the company said. Motorcycles to be sold in the United States will continue to be made in America.

Regardless, Trump said the company shouldn't shift any of its production.

"I think that Harley is an American bike, it's an American motorcycle and they shouldn't play cute," he added.

As he reminded Bartiromo, Trump hosted some of the company's top officials at the White House in February 2017, when he said the company was a "true American icon."

Trump's remarks Sunday echoed his comments on Twitter during the week. He tweeted Tuesday: "If they move, watch, it will be the beginning of the end — they surrendered, they quit! The Aura will be gone and they will be taxed like never before!"

Trump Piles Pressure On Saudis Flummoxed By Oil-Price Increase

By Anthony Dipaola

[Bloomberg News](#), July 1, 2018

If the world's biggest crude exporter says it's going to ramp up production, prices usually drop. But as Saudi Arabia adds barrels before its customers get burned, prices have jumped. And Donald Trump isn't happy.

The U.S. president tweeted on Saturday that the Saudi king had agreed to raise production to cut the cost of oil for consumers. While the White House later backpedaled from his assertion, Trump on Sunday compounded the pressure, demanding that OPEC stop what he called its manipulation of the oil market and insisting the group pump more.

Saudi Arabia last month led the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries and allies including Russia into a deal aimed at cooling prices. While sticking to a 2016 agreement limiting output, they decided to pump more to offset lost supply from OPEC's Venezuela and Libya. Brent crude has gained 5.2 percent since then, due to those lost barrels and Trump's call for allies to stop buying from Iran. The benchmark rose 2 percent on Friday to \$79.12 a barrel.

"Saudi Arabia is under massive pressure," said Jaafar Altaie, managing director of consultant Manaar Group in Abu Dhabi. "The Saudis would prefer a gradual increase in oil production that won't shock the market. They prefer keeping prices between \$70 to \$80 a barrel. But for political reasons they need to react to Trump's demands."

Trump tweeted ahead of OPEC's June 22 meeting that he hoped the group would add barrels, following up on a message he sent in April during an earlier producers' meeting. China, the world's biggest oil consumer, and India, the country with the fastest-growing appetite for energy, added their own complaints after prices rose. 'Politically Motivated'

Iran, OPEC's third-largest producer, lashed out at Trump's interventions and Saudi Arabia's accommodating responses. OPEC should reject the U.S. call for a production increase that is "politically motivated against Iran," Oil Minister Bijan Namdar Zanganeh wrote in a letter to the OPEC president. An increase in any nation's output beyond limits that OPEC set in 2016 would breach the agreement, he said.

"The deal's over," said Robin Mills, chief executive officer of consultant Qamar Energy in Dubai. "It is a real blow to OPEC, in part because of the impression the Saudis are following U.S. bidding, but mostly because Saudi Arabia and Russia had stitched up a deal to raise production anyway even before the meeting."

Trump's comments could also complicate the planned sale of shares in Saudi Arabian Oil Co., said Manaar's Altaie. The initial public offering is the

centerpiece of the kingdom's strategy to diversify its economy away from oil, and the government says its could generate \$100 billion.

The U.S. president's involvement "adds to the problems that already exist in such a huge and complex IPO," Altaie said. "It furthers the impression there's a lack of independence in the company and makes it look like Trump is setting Saudi oil policy."

Saudi Arabia, which pumped 10.03 million barrels daily in May, could tap some of its 2 million barrels a day of unused production capacity to stabilize markets. But adding that full amount of crude would create a glut and could cause prices to plunge, according to analysts Wood Mackenzie Ltd. and Qamar's Mills.

It could also backfire, by deepening the divisions between geopolitical rivals Saudi Arabia and Iran and spooking markets that look to the kingdom as the world's producer of last resort.

"More oil in the market has to be bearish," Mill said. "But in the longer term, there's the countervailing issue of spare capacity that could turn out to be bullish."

The Oil Weapon Can Fell The Ayatollahs

U.S. sanctions and Saudi production are a potent combination.

By Nawaf E. Obaid

[Wall Street Journal](#), July 1, 2018

Full-text stories from the Wall Street Journal are available to Journal subscribers by clicking the link.

Exclusive: A Leaked Trump Bill To Blow Up The WTO

[Axios](#), July 1, 2018

Axios has obtained a leaked draft of a Trump administration bill — ordered by the president himself — that would declare America's abandonment of fundamental World Trade Organization rules.

Why it matters: The draft legislation is stunning. The bill essentially provides Trump a license to raise U.S. tariffs at will, without congressional consent and international rules be damned.

The details: The bill, titled the "United States Fair and Reciprocal Tariff Act," would give Trump unilateral power to ignore the two most basic principles of the WTO and negotiate one-on-one with any country:

The "Most Favored Nation" (MFN) principle that countries can't set different tariff rates for different countries outside of free trade agreements;

"Bound tariff rates" — the tariff ceilings that each WTO country has already agreed to in previous negotiations.

"It would be the equivalent of walking away from the WTO and our commitments there without us actually

notifying our withdrawal," said a source familiar with the bill.

"The good news is Congress would never give this authority to the president," the source added, describing the bill as "insane."

"It's not implementable at the border," given it would create potentially tens of thousands of new tariff rates on products. "And it would completely remove us from the set of global trade rules."

Behind the scenes: Trump was briefed on this draft in late May, according to sources familiar with the situation. Most officials involved in the bill's drafting — with the notable exception of hardline trade adviser Peter Navarro — think the bill is unrealistic or unworkable. USTR, Commerce and the White House are involved.

In a White House meeting to discuss the bill earlier this year, Legislative Affairs Director Marc Short bluntly told Navarro the bill was "dead on arrival" and would receive zero support on Capitol Hill, according to sources familiar with the exchange.

Navarro replied to Short that he thought the bill would get plenty of support, particularly from Democrats, but Short told Navarro he didn't think Democrats were in much of a mood to hand over more authority to Trump.

White House response: Spokeswoman Lindsay Walters said, "It is no secret that POTUS has had frustrations with the unfair imbalance of tariffs that put the U.S. at a disadvantage. He has asked his team to develop ideas to remedy this situation and create incentives for countries to lower their tariffs. The current system gives the U.S. no leverage and other countries no incentive."

But Walters signaled that we shouldn't take this bill as anything like a done deal. "The only way this would be news is if this were actual legislation that the administration was preparing to rollout, but it's not," she said. "Principals have not even met to review any text of legislation on reciprocal trade."

Between the lines: Note the specificity of Walters' quote above. Trump directly requested this legislation and was verbally briefed on it in May. But he hasn't met with the principals to review the text.

Be smart: Congress is already concerned with how Trump has been using his trade authorities — just look at recent efforts by Republican Sens. Bob Corker and Pat Toomey and Democratic Sen. Michael Bennet to roll back the president's steel and aluminum tariffs.

The bottom line: As a smart trade watcher told me: "The Trump administration should be more worried about not having their current authority restricted rather than expanding authority as this bill would do."

Dollar Rally Ripples Globally, Leading Investors To Reverse Course

Currency's 'absolute rampage' has hedge funds and others betting on the dollar at the expense of other markets

By Ira Iosebashvili

[Wall Street Journal](#), July 1, 2018

Full-text stories from the Wall Street Journal are available to Journal subscribers by clicking the link.

Trade War Winner Is Who Loses Least As U.S.-China Tariffs Loom

By Rich Miller And Enda Curran

[Bloomberg News](#), July 1, 2018

U.S. President Donald Trump's assertion that trade wars are "good, and easy to win" is fake news if economists are to be believed.

The victor in an economic war of attrition will instead be which nation loses least. The first salvos are set to be launched this week as America and China prepare to slap duties on each other, risking a spiral of tit-for-tat tariffs that imperils global growth.

"Everybody will lose in absolute terms in a trade war," said Nicholas Lardy, a China expert at the Peterson Institute for International Economics in Washington. The question is who "will win in relative terms."

Bloomberg Economics reckons the looming U.S. tariffs on \$50 billion of Chinese imports and a like-for-like retaliation from Beijing could cost China about 0.2 percent of gross domestic product and the U.S. a little less, a manageable amount in both instances.

It's where the dispute goes next that poses a bigger threat. The direct cost to the world's two biggest economies is probably the most straightforward forecast. From a breakdown in the global supply chain to a ratcheting up of military tension over the South China Sea, the collateral damage represents an incalculable unknown.

"I've got a fairly high anxiety at this point about how this is all going to play out," former U.S. Treasury Secretary Lawrence Summers told Bloomberg Television in June.

In a full-blown global trade war, Bloomberg Economics reckons a 10 percent increase in U.S. tariffs and a similar response from the rest of the world would knock 0.5 percent off global GDP by 2020, not taking account of any financial market fallout. That's about \$470 billion, roughly the same as Thailand's annual output. The U.S. would suffer more than China because it would face the wrath of all its trading partners.

Judging by the financial markets, investors seem to think the U.S. has the upper hand. The Shanghai

Shenzhen CSI 300 Index is down about 14 percent this year, hit by an economic slowdown and rising trade tensions. The Standard & Poor's 500 Index, in contrast, is up almost 2 percent, buoyed by a strong economy. While U.S. companies are benefiting from a tax-cut boost to earnings, Chinese firms are suffering as deleveraging dents the supply of credit.

One thing in the U.S.'s favor is that its economy relies more on demand from home than abroad, meaning trade barriers will exert less of a pinch. Exports amounted to almost 12 percent of U.S. GDP in 2016, compared with close to 20 percent for China, World Bank data show.

America also has more to shoot at – a point made repeatedly by Trump. It imported \$505 billion of goods from China last year but sent only about \$130 billion in the other direction.

The president is also hoping costlier imports will drive companies to increasingly base their operations in the U.S. rather than low-cost China, supporting domestic demand and providing more jobs for American workers.

In a June 19 paper for the C.D. Howe Institute, economists Meredith Crowley and Dan Ciuriak argued that Trump is “weaponizing uncertainty”: Companies that want to be sure of selling in the U.S. are being compelled to set up shop in America.

Beijing, though, is far from defenseless. U.S. companies sold \$280 billion worth of goods and services in China last year through their local subsidiaries, according to Deutsche Bank AG.

Those operations are vulnerable to government-inspired buyer boycotts, customs delays and other restrictions on their business – the same sort of tactics China employed in past disputes with South Korea and Japan.

“No U.S. product sold in China, or U.S. company invested in China, can be considered safe from its retaliation,” said Yanmei Xie, a China policy analyst for Gavekal Dragonomics in Beijing.

The Asian country also has room on the fiscal and monetary policy fronts to support domestic demand and offset damage to the economy from U.S. tariffs. Its central bank said last week it'll use comprehensive policy tools to steady its economy and stabilize market expectations.

As a last resort, it could even pare its holdings of U.S. Treasuries or allow the yuan to decline further, pushing up U.S. interest rates and making American exports to China costlier.

Perhaps Beijing's biggest advantage is political. Trump, the elected leader of a democratic nation that votes for its lower house every two years, has already gotten grief from farm state lawmakers and others who'll

be hurt by Chinese retaliation; on the other hand, Chinese leader Xi Jinping cemented his hold on power in March with the repeal of term limits.

“President Xi has an almost infinite amount of political capital inside of China,” Nathan Sheets, chief economist for PGIM Fixed Income and a former U.S. Treasury undersecretary for international affairs, told Bloomberg Television.

The impact of U.S. tariffs will also be spread throughout Asia since China often acts as an assembly point for parts from the rest of the region before products are shipped to America.

Taiwan, Malaysia and South Korea would be particularly hurt, though companies as far afield as Chile, South Africa and Germany also might feel the fallout, Bloomberg economists Fielding Chen and Tom Orlik wrote in a recent note.

Indeed, German automaker Daimler AG cut its profit outlook on June 21, saying fewer Chinese customers will buy made-in-Alabama Mercedes-Benz SUVs, because of retaliatory duties Beijing is slapping on cars imported from the U.S.

The ripples from the trade battle are certain to spread further, with greater casualties, the longer the skirmish between the world's two biggest economies lasts and the more it intensifies.

“This really is a standoff where both sides think they have the upper hand,” Sheets said. “That's one of the things that scares me about it.”

Taiwan's Technology Secrets Come Under Assault From China

By Chuin-Wei Yap

[Wall Street Journal](#), July 1, 2018

Full-text stories from the Wall Street Journal are available to Journal subscribers by clicking the link.

America Needs To Sell More Weapons

Excessive restrictions on arms deals help China and Russia and harm U.S. national security interests.

By Alexander Benard

[Wall Street Journal](#), July 1, 2018

Full-text stories from the Wall Street Journal are available to Journal subscribers by clicking the link.

States Act On Their Own To Fill Holes Washington Is Knocking In Affordable Care Act

By Amy Goldstein

[Washington Post](#), July 1, 2018

The first Sunday after his inauguration, New Jersey Gov. Phil Murphy signed an executive order directing state agencies to report everything they could do to ramp up the visibility of the Affordable Care Act and persuade more people to buy health coverage under the law.

Four months later, the Democratic governor signed into law a requirement that makes New Jersey the first state in a dozen years to compel most residents to carry insurance.

As bureaucrats in Trenton now scramble to set the mandate in motion, New Jersey's decisions are at the forefront of a nascent movement with states stepping out on their own to counteract Washington's efforts to erode the ACA.

New Jersey's insurance provision and a similar one that the D.C. Council adopted last week are timed to begin in January, when a federal penalty is scheduled to disappear for Americans who violate the mandate built into the health-care law. A requirement that Vermont just approved is supposed to take effect in 2020, once officials settle on its specifics.

Several states are erecting barriers against rules the Trump administration is writing to promote short-term health plans that are comparatively inexpensive because they lack benefits and consumer protections guaranteed by the ACA. And some states, led by Democrats and Republicans alike, are trying to slow insurance rate increases through methods that Congress considered but did not pass.

"There are all these federal changes that are happening, and some states are pushing back on them and some states are taking advantage of them," said Jason Levitis, a consultant who led the development of the ACA's tax components at the Treasury Department during the Obama administration. "The most important and interesting health policy action is in states."

Taken together, the moves mean the nation is starting to revert to the insurance landscape of a decade ago — a hodgepodge that created the political pressures that culminated in the sweeping 2010 law. At the time, Americans' ability to find and afford decent health plans, especially if they could not get one through a job, depended on where they lived and whether they were healthy or sick.

"The ACA was about standardizing, and now we are going back to more divergence," said Heather Howard, a lecturer at Princeton University's Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs. "It is much more of a patchwork quilt."

The latest wave of state-by-state decisions is a sequel of sorts to a process that the Supreme Court unleashed in 2012. The justices ruled, 5 to 4, that the

law was constitutional but that each state could decide whether to embrace its expansion of Medicaid, the public insurance program for the poor, to include residents with slightly higher incomes. Thirty-four states have expanded their programs since then, most recently Virginia, and three more are considering the idea.

The high court did not give states latitude on any of the law's other elements. But action — as well as inaction — by the Trump administration and the GOP-led Congress is starting to have that effect.

New federal rules allow states to require low-income residents to work or prepare for jobs to qualify for Medicaid. The Department of Health and Human Services has signed off on four states' proposals, though a federal judge just blocked Kentucky's plan, the first, from starting on Sunday.

And several states are asking for federal permission to create "reinsurance" funds, or pools of money that help protect insurers from the risk of covering customers who need high-cost medical services. This approach, intended to help stabilize fragile ACA insurance marketplaces, was part of the law early on. Senate GOP moderates tried and failed to recreate such a fund last year.

States with Democratic governors, including Minnesota and Oregon, have embraced reinsurance funds, as has Wisconsin, where Gov. Scott Walker (R) an outspoken conservative and ACA foe, is boasting about the idea in campaign ads as he runs for a third term.

The Maryland General Assembly just passed legislation calling for a reinsurance program. That measure and another launching a study of a possible state insurance mandate emerged from the Maryland Health Insurance Coverage Protection Commission, created last year to try to blunt what the Trump administration was starting to do to the federal law.

Other states are acting in anticipation of HHS rules that would make it easier for consumers to buy skimpy health plans originally meant for a brief coverage gap, such as when people are between jobs. These short-term plans can go further than other coverage in deviating from ACA insurance protections, charging more to people with preexisting medical conditions or refusing to sell them insurance. The Obama administration restricted the plans to three months; Trump administration officials want to extend them to just under a year.

In Maryland, however, a new law will hold the plans to three months. California's legislature is considering the same limitation.

Colorado is not restricting such plans but is trying to teach consumers about them so "people make sure

they understand what they are purchasing,” said Michael Conway, the state’s interim insurance commissioner. “They often look very appealing to people” because premiums can be low, Lee said. But the coverage may not include mental health services, prescription drugs or care for preexisting medical conditions.

Among the states’ various steps, the boldest are the ones replacing the ACA insurance mandate with their own. Until now, only Massachusetts has had a requirement that residents have health insurance as part of 2006 changes that foreshadowed much of the federal law four years later.

The D.C. Council passed its requirement among measures related to the city’s next budget. At a hearing this spring, Council member Vincent C. Gray (D-Ward 7), a former mayor who leads the health committee, blasted the “complete assault on the Affordable Care Act” since President Trump took office. “But establishing an individual mandate here in the city will ensure that people will continue to have insurance,” Gray said.

New Jersey’s “Health Insurance Market Preservation Act,” which Murphy signed into law this spring, will affect more people than any other state’s insurance provision. In the months before it takes effect, the governor’s aides are racing to conduct actuarial studies of how much it will cost to carry out and how much the state is likely to collect in penalties, which, like the District’s, will be identical to the federal penalty soon going away.

The mandate is part of a broad effort by Murphy to reverse a recent slump in ACA coverage — paralleling a nationwide dip the past two years — as the Trump administration shortened the annual sign-up period and slashed federal aid for advertising and organizations that help people enroll.

According to New Jersey Health Commissioner Shereef Elnahal, “It is imperative that we do everything we can to not only protect the . . . population that we have insured with this law, but to encourage even more people to sign up.”

The IRS Can Save American Health Care

Letting workers spend pretax dollars on insurance would do a lot—without requiring Congress to act.

By Regina Herzlinger And Joel Klein

[Wall Street Journal](#), July 1, 2018

Full-text stories from the Wall Street Journal are available to Journal subscribers by clicking the link.

The Malaria Fight Stalls As Children Die By The Hundreds Of Thousands

By Editorial Board

[Washington Post](#), July 1, 2018

FOR YEARS, global public-health officials have been at war with malaria, a disease that kills more than 445,000 people annually, about 70 percent of them children under 5 years old. The number of cases and deaths has steadily dropped for a decade and a half. As philanthropist Bill Gates told a global conference in April, half the world is now malaria-free. But the battle shows signs of stalling.

In 2016, the latest year for which data has been published, the number of malaria cases went up to 215 million, from 210 million the year before. The director general of the World Health Organization, Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus, said, “We are beginning to see reversals in the gains achieved.” Africa still accounts for 90 percent of the burden, but Venezuela, once nearly malaria-free, shows that when a nation falls apart, disease can rush in. A WHO official has reported that the incidence of malaria in Venezuela in 2017 jumped 69 percent from the previous year, to more than 400,000 cases, and is five times higher than in 2013. As Venezuela fell into political and economic chaos, its public-health systems collapsed, leaving the country without insecticides, drugs, mosquito nets, diagnostic equipment and surveillance, all key tools in the battle against the disease, caused by a parasite and spread by the mosquito.

As Mr. Gates pointed out, globally, tools that brought progress are wearing out. The nets, sprays and drugs “aren’t working as well as they used to.” The mosquitoes are increasingly resistant to the insecticide widely used in mosquito nets, pyrethroid. At the same time, in the Mekong River region in Southeast Asia, a commonly used anti-malaria drug, artemisinin, has been losing its punch as the parasites become resistant. So far, this resistance has not spread to Africa, fortunately. But there has been a sharp drop-off of indoor spraying in Africa, and only slightly more than half of all people in sub-Saharan Africa are sleeping under treated nets, the primary prevention method. It is critical in malaria cases to get prompt health care, but still only 1 in 3 children in Africa do so. The WHO chief said the \$2.7 billion committed annually to anti-malaria efforts is less than half of what is needed.

For the first time, a vaccine shows partial protection against malaria in young children and has been cleared for pilot introduction in Africa to complement other efforts. Over the longer run, there is hope that technology such as the genetic editing tool known as CRISPR can be used to modify mosquitoes so they don’t spread the disease. This seems like an example of the kind of genetic editing that would present

a handsome payoff to humankind and be worth the risk if it works.

The fight against malaria can't be won with a dramatic "moonshot" campaign but rather by action on many fronts. A stall, after so much promise, would be terrible and costly.

Judge: Rosenstein's 'Any Links' Mandate Gives Mueller A Broad Scope

By Rowan Scarborough

[Washington Times](#), July 1, 2018

Understanding why special counsel Robert Mueller has widened his Russia investigation beyond the 2016 presidential election may require perusing a federal judge's opinion on June 26 in the Paul Manafort case.

After District Court Judge T.S. Ellis III dissected Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein's May 2017 appointment order to Mr. Mueller, he concluded that the prosecutor is empowered to look at virtually any Russian contact no matter how "stale" it is.

What's more, Judge Ellis said, Mr. Rosenstein's guidelines state that Mr. Mueller is to investigate any links between the Russian government and Trump campaign associates, which is expansive.

Citing Supreme Court rulings, he said "any links" also means "indirect links" or "potential links," giving Mr. Mueller wide latitude when deciding whether to target a Trump person.

J.D. Gordon, a Trump campaign adviser, said such an expansive definition is why so many people find themselves sitting down with the FBI.

Mr. Gordon, a retired Navy officer and former Pentagon spokesman, has gone through combative interviews with congressional committees and the Mueller prosecutors, racking up hefty legal bills.

He was summoned partly because he spoke briefly with the Russian ambassador at the Republican National Convention, where the diplomat was a guest sponsored by President Obama's State Department.

Mr. Gordon also supervised the volunteer Trump national security advisory committee, whose members included Carter Page and George Papadopoulos, both of whom came under intense Mueller scrutiny. Mr. Papadopoulos pleaded guilty to lying to the FBI about the timing of his meeting with a Moscow-connected professor.

In London, Mr. Papadopoulos was trying to set up a meeting between Donald Trump the candidate and Kremlin officials. But no such meeting ever happened and neither Mr. Carter nor Mr. Papadopoulos has been charged in any conspiracy.

"In a politically toxic environment like today, the higher you go, the more likely the opposition will push for your investigation," Mr. Gordon told The Washington Times. "If and when they manage to haul you before a judge, your fate is basically a roll of the dice based upon the actions of FBI leadership during the Obama administration. The Trump-Russia probes are tyrannical by definition."

FBI agent Peter Strzok, a fierce anti-Trump player according to his own text messages, started the investigation of the Trump campaign in late July 2016. There is some evidence that the bureau deployed confidential human sources among campaign advisers (Republicans call them "spies") before that date.

Judge Ellis issued his ruling in the case of Mr. Manafort, a Republican political consultant who served briefly as Mr. Trump's campaign manager. Mr. Mueller brought charges of income tax evasion and money laundering stemming from millions of dollars Mr. Manafort was paid by the pro-Russia political party of former Ukrainian President Viktor Yanukovich.

Judge Ellis has been critical of Mr. Mueller and his top Manafort prosecutor, Andrew Weissmann. He accused the Mueller team of an ulterior motive, saying they charged Mr. Manafort as a way to get their true target: Mr. Trump.

But Judge Ellis was no help to Mr. Manafort on the defendant's motion to dismiss the indictment because the purported conduct had nothing to do with the 2016 election.

The judge denied the petition and, in doing so, defined "any link" as "indirect link."

"Nonetheless, the fact that Yanukovich was a strongly pro-Russian President warranted the investigation here. The fact that the Russian government did not make payments to defendant directly is not determinative because the text of the May 17 Appointment Order authorizes investigation of 'any links and/or coordination between the Russian government and individuals associated with the campaign of President Donald Trump,'" Judge Ellis wrote.

He invoked Supreme Court precedent that "the term 'any' has an expansive meaning, that is, 'one or some indiscriminately of whatever kind.'"

Therefore, "the May 17 Appointment Order plainly authorizes the investigation of indirect links between Trump campaign officials and the Russian government in addition to more direct connections. In this regard, the May 17 Appointment Order authorizes the Special Counsel to investigate defendant's ties with individuals financially and politically supported by the Russian government, even where, as here, those individuals are

not themselves members of the Russian government,” the judge ruled.

Judge Ellis then used the phrase “potential links.”

“In sum, Appointment Order makes clear that the Special Counsel’s investigation into the payments defendant received from Russian-backed Ukrainian officials was authorized because the investigation involved potential links between a Trump campaign official — the defendant — and the Russian government via the Russian-backed Ukrainian President.”

That “any link” includes potential or indirect links is being played out in other ways.

For example, former Navy SEAL Erik Prince, who made a fortune providing private security contractors to governments and corporations, is being investigated by Mr. Mueller over a postelection conversation he had with a Russian hedge fund manager in a Seychelles resort.

Mr. Prince, an informal adviser to the Trump campaign, told the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence that the get-together was impromptu in a hotel bar. The Washington Post reported that the meeting may have been planned.

Whichever is true, the Prince case shows how the Rosenstein mandate works: If a person met a Russian and had ties to the Trump campaign, Mr. Mueller can investigate him.

As a presidential candidate, Mr. Trump was unique. His career was global land development, not politics. In that business, he and his company would naturally make contacts with foreign investors from Russia and many other countries.

Mr. Mueller is also examining other postelection contacts. The Post says he is scrutinizing contributions from Russian-linked billionaires to the Trump inaugural committee.

Democrats wholeheartedly support Mr. Mueller and defend the FBI’s anti-Trump tactics. But more Republicans are starting to say the investigation, nearly two years from the time the FBI opened it, should be wrapped up.

At a House Judiciary Committee hearing last week, Rep. Trey Gowdy, South Carolina Republican, told Mr. Rosenstein and FBI Director Christopher A. Wray, “Whatever you got, finish it the hell up.”

Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell, a Kentucky Republican who has supported the investigation, told the Washington Examiner, “What I think about the Mueller investigation is, they ought to wrap it up. It’s gone on seemingly forever, and I don’t know how much more they think they can find out.”